LIBRARY
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXVII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18 NUMBER 1259

Tom Mooney Goes Free

The day of Tom Mooney's release is a happy one for the editors of this paper. For two decades we have fought to obtain his freedom, having been among the first to call attention to the findings of President Wilson's investigating committee (of which Professor Felix Frankfurter was an important member). We propose now to continue our efforts to win his liberty for Warren K. Billings, whose case is on all fours with that of Mooney.

We wish we could share the belief of our radical friends that it was labor, rising in its might, that struck open the door of the jail, or alternatively, that we could second the opinion of The New York Times that the conscience of America at last began to itch to an intolerable degree. Neither of these theories seems to us true. The voice of labor was heard ten years ago just as strongly as it was last week, yet Mooney did not go free. As for the conscience of the country, we see no evidence that it was effective.

The actual explanation is that California finally elected a Governor who was not terrorized by the state's conservatives, conservatives who knew Mooney was innocent but wanted him kept in jail anyhow. The Mooney case was not an important issue in the election. The chief factor in Governor Olson's victory, according to experts on the spot, was his support by the "$30-Every-Thursday" movement. There are still many powerful men in California who, like the members of the State Supreme Court, hate Mooney and regret the fact that after taking away twenty-two years of his life, California has set him free. They do not understand that the most important issue has never been Tom Mooney's freedom or imprisonment. It has been the question whether Americans any longer care for American principles, whether our judicial system has the power to rectify its own errors, and is able publicly to confess and correct its own misdeeds.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter

Felix Frankfurter, who was responsible for the report that first brought the Mooney case to public attention, was, by a happy coincidence, appointed to the Supreme Court in the same week that Tom Mooney was set free. Freedom for the Californian has been one of his life's ambitions. But Mr. Frankfurter's courageous sense of justice has been equaled by his legal scholarship and his mastery of public problems. Surely no American of this generation has been more completely in the great tradition of American jurisprudence than this professor at Harvard Law School. Already he has exerted a profound influence on the American legal structure: all over this country his former students are putting into effect, before the bench or on it, his principles of law as a living, vital force that changes and must change with the times. His wide-ranging intellectual interests; his abhorrence of the second-rate in thought or action; his ability to make and keep the friendship of leaders; his deep knowledge

CONTENTS

The Week 297

Editorials

Yes and No to the President 299
WPA Scandals of 1938 300
Save the Civil Liberties Inquiry . . . 301
Robert Herrick 302

General Articles

Dewey: Master of the Commonplace . . . . . C. E. Ayres 303
Phaeton (verse) . . . John Peale Bishop 306
Neutrality: Shall We Have Revision? . . . . . Charles A. Beard 307
Lima Addition . . . John T. Whitaker 309
Colossus in the West . Richard L. Neuberger 310
Shoot the Works . . . Heywood Broun 312
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 313
Other People's Money . . John T. Flynn 314
Daughters and Others . . Otis Ferguson 315
The Bandwagon 316

Correspondence 316

Transatlantic View . . . Malcolm Cowley 318

Books in Review

Brokers of Ideas . . . Harold J. Laski 320
A Heavy Review of Light Verse . . . . . Edmund Wilson 321
On What Foundations? . Eduard C. Lindeman 321
Goya Lives On . . . Richard Watts Jr. 322
Labor History . . . . Samuel Yellen 323
New Books: A Reader's List 324

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1939, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49TH ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the law both historically and contemporaneously, all make him an ideal choice to succeed such men as Cardozo and Holmes. The fact that with Mr. Justice Cardozo's death all minds turned to Professor Frankfurter was a spontaneous tribute as remarkable as the way in which even enemies of the New Deal approved the actual choice when it was made.

The Wrong Mr. Smith

It looks as if President William Green of the AF of L had pulled a boner. Last summer when the term of Donald W. Smith of the National Labor Relations Board expired, Mr. Green in his usual heavy-handed manner announced that the AF of L would fight him to the death. The President thereupon promptly declared his intention of reappointing Mr. Smith. But apparently Mr. Green made a mistake in his Smiths. Donald W. had consistently voted in favor of craft unionism whenever the issue had come before the Board; it was Edwin S., another member, who favored the CIO form of industrial organization. Mr. John L. Lewis, given the chance to come to the aid of Donald W., quietly declined to do so. Since the AF of L cannot for reasons of prestige admit Mr. Green's blunder, Donald W. will probably be dropped and a new man appointed—perhaps one who will be more to the liking of Mr. Lewis. We should hate to go hunting with Mr. Green. He might mistake one of his own party for a rabbit.

Spanish "Diversion"

With the Fascist drive still slowly progressing in Catalonia, the Republic last week began an attack in the southwestern Estramadura section. Although Fascist communiques called it a mere diversion, this attack had nevertheless progressed by January 9 past Azuaga, an important railway town some thirty miles west of the starting-point of the action, and was within striking distance of the Seville-Merida-Caceres railway that is the main Fascist north-south line of communication. A further government advance would be very dangerous for Franco, and although it was reported that Italian staff officers were in favor of ignoring the southwest for continuation of the northern drive, there was a considerable possibility that Franco might be forced to send aid from his forces in Catalonia. The government also announced that its troops had withdrawn from the untenable salient created between the Fascist advances through Artesa and Borjas Blancas, so that the line is now roughly straightened from near Artesa to Vimbodi. This means that after more than two weeks of fighting the Fascists have finally reached the main fortified line, which they must now attempt to break.

Two rumors bore upon this indecisive situation, the first that the Republic was massing troops and supplies for an attack on the northern Catalonia front, near the French border, and the second that Franco had removed Queipo de Llano, chief of southern Rebel Spain, as a result of his inability to stop the Republican attack.

Philanthropist

The American government has offered to give half a million bushels of wheat for distribution to non-combatants on both sides of the Spanish battle lines. But that doesn't please some of the Franco partisans in this country. Merwin K. Hart, who often acts as their spokesman, has written a letter of protest to the State Department. "The proposal," he says, "to send food to both sides in Spain will result in little or none of the food reaching Nationalist Spain (for it is not required there), and practically all of it going to those in Loyalist or Red Spain."

That seems a smug and feeble argument for letting people starve to death. But it is also an argument based on false premises. An official agency of the Franco government—the Auxilio Social, acting through its American representative, the Spanish Nationalist Relief Committee—not only admits but advertises month after month in a pro-Fascist magazine that Franco's people are hungry. "The helpless children of Spain need your aid now! . . . Your contribution, however small, will help to alleviate untold suffering among helpless non-combatants in strife-torn Spain. It will help feed starving children and their destitute elders. Bread! Will you let them cry in vain for bread?" The United States government and the Quakers propose to feed them, along with the Loyalist children. Mr. Hart, that philanthropist, wants to let them cry in vain.

The President Talks to His Party

In his Jackson Day speech, Mr. Roosevelt gave firm indication of his intention not to sacrifice the New Deal for party harmony. He continued his leadership of Democratic progressivism, warning his opponents that if they succeeded in nominating a conservative or an opportunist in 1940 the party would lose power sooner or later. There are not enough party Democrats in the country to elect a President without the support of the forward-looking masses. If the conservatives are dissatisfied to remain in a liberal party, he suggested that they join the Republicans, who at heart will remain conservative. This is a difficult argument to answer. The trouble is that the anti-New Deal Democrats do not thrive by answering reasoned arguments. They do so by raising false issues and attacking the administration from the rear. Watch them in the new session of Congress!

It's a Crazy World

Moscow has provided a happy ending to the romance of the English engineer with the Russian wife. For four years he had tried unsuccessfully either to get into Russia to be with her or to get her out to be with him.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At last he learned to fly, got hold of a rickety airplane, and crossed the border without a passport. He was arrested, jailed for six weeks, tried and fined for his offense, and finally set free but expelled from the Soviet Union. His wife was permitted to go with him to London, where he "hopes to find a job." We share the rejoicing that the Lochinvar story ends thus happily; but we also marvel that people should seem to feel a government has done something pretty handsome in permitting a husband and wife to be together and try to support themselves. It is a commentary on the kind of world we live in, a world where all sorts of governments—our own included—separate families without the least compunction, in obedience to the whims of red tape, or for even worse reasons. Germany as usual takes the prize for cruelty, deporting hundreds of Jewish babies and detaining their parents, but nearly all other countries act almost as badly. What sort of planet has this one degenerated into anyway, where human suffering no longer counts for anything once you have put on the coat of authority?

News Notes of a Week

The Japanese government was reorganized, bringing into power Baron Hiranuma, who comes as close to being a fascist dictator as anyone in the Island Kingdom. . . . The Poles, after having strengthened their ties with Soviet Russia a few weeks ago, negotiated successively with Germany and France, apparently in the effort to play off one threatening danger against another. . . . "Augur," who often speaks for the British Foreign Office, announced that the Rome-Berlin axis includes a definite military alliance. . . . Chiang Kai-shek put through a "purge" of those who have been urging an immediate peace.

The State Department revealed that since last July, it has virtually forbidden the export of airplanes or bombs to countries whose governments conduct air raids against civilians. Japan and "Spain" are on the list; there is no explanation as to why Germany and Italy are omitted, or Great Britain, which has bombed civilians in Palestine and on the Indian frontier. . . . The "lunatic fringe" of the Catholic Church was unusually active. Invited by the Spanish Ambassador to visit Loyalist Spain and see for himself the conditions there, the Most Reverend Michael Curley, Archbishop of Baltimore, called the Ambassador "a common ordinary liar" and added "I guess he would have me come over wearing my clerical collar—and get murdered." In New York City, representatives of several Catholic organizations staged a near riot, demonstrating in favor of a proposal that school buildings should be closed to "controversial meetings." . . . Although the Dies Committee has become a national laughing-stock, many members of Congress have indicated a desire to appropriate a large additional sum and continue its activities.

Yes and No to the President

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE to the new Congress indicates his usual sensitive appreciation of the tides of popular emotion. The American people have become aroused about the aggressions, past and potential, of the totalitarian states. They are determined to safeguard this country against the incursions of those who would destroy democracy. It was useful for the President to give expression to these feelings; few indeed fail to share them.

If this is the way we feel, what are we going to do about it? Naturally the first item on the program is provision for impregnable defense against possible military attack on this continent. The President can command almost universal support for this purpose. Congress can be counted upon to provide increased appropriations. At this writing the President has not defined in any detail what he means by adequate defense. The New Republic, with the expert military advice of Major G. F. Eliot, has repeatedly during the past year made clear its opinion concerning the outlines and limits of a sensible program. Briefly, it involves speeding up naval construction already authorized, with some additions, more naval and air bases, construction of the Nicaragua canal and more adequate equipment for the army. It does not mean a greatly enlarged army, such as would be useful only for an overseas campaign, or an armada of aircraft several times larger than would be required to repel any conceivable air attack—an armada that would rapidly become obsolete—or industrial preparations to equip a great expeditionary force. We do not wish to imitate our enemies by becoming a state in which everything is subordinated to the military, and fortunately we can be safe against attack without doing so.

It is well that the President does not use the hostility against foreign enemies to divert attention from the necessity of continuing a program of internal reconstruction. We need more efficient organization of the executive department, and a solution of the railroad problem—these matters are in the hands of Congress. Above all we need to end unemployment—to put to work "idle men and idle capital." We cannot do this without a continuation of large governmental expenditure. The fact that the piling up of deficits creates a growing national debt should not alarm us as long as the total of debts, private and public, is no larger than in 1929. The deficit will disappear without great increase in tax rates if we can push the national income up where it should be by utilizing our productive capacity.

There is just one danger in this part of the speech—a danger at present merely a matter of emphasis. The President puts forward his recommendations for domestic reconstruction as a subordinate item in his plea for national defense. We shall not be strong enough to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resist attack, he says in effect, unless we have a healthy economy and an absence of internal dissension. This is true enough, but it is well to remember that the greatest peril to democracy lies not so much in the chance of external conquest as in the possibility of internal disintegration and a native brand of fascism. It is of primary importance to create a sound democratic society, even if not a single hostile battleship or bomber should ever be directed against our shores. Military defense is incidental to our domestic purpose, not the reverse.

The President's recommendation that the Neutrality Act be modified in order to grant him discretion to apply economic sanctions against aggressors alone is full of danger. The New Republic has many times presented its reasons for believing this to be so, and Dr. Charles A. Beard, probably the most distinguished of American historians and political scientists, again argues this case in his article, "Neutrality: Shall We Have Revision?" in this issue. Economic sanctions applied to but one party in a general war are almost certain to lead to our participation in that war. If we want to fight, let us decide to do so on the merits of the case, rather than being led step by step into the hostilities by executive action, without knowing where we are going.

Meanwhile Mr. Roosevelt is so muddled as to the present effects of the act as to be almost subject to the charge of being disingenuous. Because of the neutrality law, he implies, we are giving or may give aid to aggressors. How and where he does not specify. It is true that we are aiding Japan through the export to her of munitions and war materials. *But we are doing so only because the President has refused to apply the Neutrality Act in the Asiatic war—contrary to the clear intention of Congress.* We are also aiding Franco in Spain by refusing to sell munitions to either side, while Franco is liberally supplied by Italy and Germany. *But this is not a consequence of the neutrality law—it is in obedience to a special resolution of Congress adopted at the urgent request of the President himself.* This resolution should be repealed, and the President should exercise his discretion under the neutrality law, as he is permitted by its terms, to allow the sale of munitions to the Loyalists. Or, better still, the law should be amended to exclude civil wars from its general terms, allowing the President to permit the sale, on a cash-and-carry basis, of war materials to constitutional democracies defending themselves against rebellion. The New Republic, which has from the beginning supported the neutrality legislation, has also from the beginning opposed its application to civil wars, and to the Spanish war in particular.

Those who fear that in a general European war the Neutrality Act would favor the Fascist aggressors simply are blind to the economic and military facts. Under it, those nations that control the seas and possess cash purchasing power in this country would have a virtual monopoly on our economic aid. These nations are Canada, Great Britain, France and the smaller European neutrals such as Holland and Switzerland. Germany and Italy know well that in case of war they could hardly get a dollar's worth of goods from this country, under the Neutrality Act as it stands.

Those who want to modify the Neutrality Act as the President recommends can seriously desire to do so —if they acknowledge the plain facts of the situation— not because of any fear of giving aid to aggressors, but because they want to free the President to lead us blindfold into war.

WPA Scandals of 1938

THE Senate Committee on Campaign Expenditures has now reported on the 1938 elections. It found evidence that WPA funds were used improperly for political purposes in three states, Kentucky, Tennessee and Pennsylvania. In these states and in varying degrees, WPA employees contributed to campaign funds, sometimes under pressure. Relief payrolls were increased before the elections and curtailed afterward. Some people were paid wages who did no work. There was some evidence of coercion to compel WPA workers to vote for specified candidates.

These are serious disclosures and deserve to be taken seriously. We hope that the laws will be stiffened against such practices and that public opinion, which is always so much more effective than legal statutes, can also be invoked. Yet without minimizing the seriousness of the facts brought out, we find reason for some qualified optimism about this situation.

The newspapers headlined their articles "WPA Graft Found in Three States." They might on the contrary have said "WPA Guiltless in Forty-five States." Knowing what we do of the past record of American state, county and municipal government, we are astonished that so few commonwealths were proved to err. The committee investigated charges against Maryland, Missouri, New York, Indiana, New Jersey and Ohio, all of which were given a clean bill of health. Compared with the old days, this is a miracle of reform.

Another striking fact is that even in the three states where conditions were bad, no high official was involved. The committee recommends no challenge to any election result. In particular, there is no reason to believe that Harry Hopkins or anyone else in Washington knew what was taking place.

It is worth remembering that graft and inefficiency in the WPA are chiefly the fault of Congress itself. It was Senators and Representatives, looking for a chance for fat patronage, who refused to permit the whole WPA staff to be put under civil service. They wanted instead to appoint incompetent political hacks, and in many cases they did. It is the worst sort of hypocrisy for them now to complain that some of these political hacks proved true to type. Before their action,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the early days of the WPA and under the FERA and the CWA, vast sums were spent without a suggestion of scandal anywhere.

It was Congress, also, that insisted on decentralizing the WPA and making it depend upon voluntary cooperation by the individual states. They did this in the sacred name of states' rights, ignoring the fact that by this policy they made it almost impossible for the authorities in Washington to maintain proper high standards. To a serious extent, they threw the WPA into the hands of the dominant local political machines, whether Republican or Democratic, and these machines acted as they always do. When a Congressman puts a cheap politician in as state administrator, the latter makes as many appointments as possible in the state among men of the same type. The President has ordered the WPA personnel under civil service beginning February 1, but there is good reason to believe that the politicians on the Hill, who don't really want efficiency and honesty, will block this move. Today, Congress is proposing to allocate federal WPA funds on a basis of existing federal aid to roads, a perfectly idiotic distribution which takes no account of the varying needs throughout the country.

The Senate Committee makes a number of proposals to prevent a recurrence of scandal. It wants a similar committee to function during each election in the future. Candidates for the Senate should report their expenditures in primaries as well as in elections. All federal employees should be forbidden to contribute to candidates or to spokesmen for them. Relief officials must keep the list of clients secret—as Harry Hopkins has always insisted should be the case. It should be a felony, not just a misdemeanor, to take men off work-relief projects because of their political attitude. Coercion by relief officials must be stopped. The free-mailing privilege of Congressmen should be restricted.

Most of these proposals seem sensible, though we are disturbed by the plan to prevent people on relief from contributing for political purposes. While they should certainly be protected from enforced contributions, it is also important that their rights as citizens should be maintained. The administration has made a useful suggestion in proposing that a committee of prominent citizens should be set up in each county in the United States to watch over the distribution of WPA funds locally. Finally, however, the most urgent reformation is required in Congress itself.

The situation at the moment is a beautiful example of what we need and don't get. President Roosevelt has asked $875,000,000 to carry the WPA from February 1 to July 1. Friends of the relief program have insisted that at least a billion is required. The conservatives have been demanding that the amount be cut to $600,000,000. Even $875,000,000 will only carry 3,000,000 workers to June 1. If the President's recommendation is accepted, things will be bad enough; if the conservatives get their way, they will be a lot worse. All this uncertainty is needless. The care of the unemployed ought to be taken out of politics and kept out; after ten years, surely the country should have learned that this is a permanent problem to be handled unemotionally, on a long-term basis.

Save the Civil Liberties Inquiry

THERE IS A DANGER that the Senate committee investigating civil liberties, under the chairmanship of Senator Robert M. La Follette, will have to end its activities before its work is done. Congress from the beginning has been chary of providing funds for this committee, because its revelations have embarrassed powerful interests. In order to obtain the necessary appropriation last year, Senator La Follette was obliged to promise that he would not ask for another when that had run out. He now feels bound by this promise, but there is no good reason why the Senate should not continue to finance the work without a special request from him.

To end the investigation and the hearings now would be unfortunate, for several reasons. First, a mass of important material has been gathered about labor espionage and preparations for anti-union warfare in California, which cannot become public unless it is spread on the records. Though the California die-hards are for the moment subdued by the victory of a liberal Democratic Governor in the recent election—the first in California for many years—they are simply biding their time. Refusal by the Senate to allow the facts to be known would increase the danger of serious industrial conflict in the future, and would make Governor Olson's task harder. Second, no remedial legislation has been passed to deal with the abuses previously discovered, and the committee needs more time to prepare and support it. Third, and most important of all, this is a period when the protection of civil liberties in this country is more essential than ever before. If we really fear totalitarianism, it is far more essential to maintain freedom for speech, the press, assembly and labor organization than to build armament against an unlikely invasion from abroad. Nothing holds the forces of darkness in check like a senatorial searchlight always in readiness to be turned upon their activities. To keep this searchlight burning would not cost one percent as much as the price of a single battleship.

The work of the La Follette Committee in exposing the dirty work of labor espionage agencies and other enemies of liberty has been sober and well documented. Extreme care has been taken to include only reliable evidence. The reports constitute a series of records that not only have been indispensable in checking conspiracies against civil peace and freedom in the present, but that will long remain invaluable for history and political science. Why should work of this kind be stopped?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Robert Herrick

ROBERT HERRICK belonged to the group of writers who may be regarded as the successors of Howells and Henry James, a group which included David Graham Phillips and Frank Norris. From Howells they inherited the realism and sense of social protest with which he viewed the American scene, and they exercised both with greater boldness and decision. From James they learned to regard fiction as a fine art, in the practice of which Edith Wharton was their contemporary.

Herrick began his career as editor of The Harvard Monthly, founded the year he entered college by an extraordinary editorial board of undergraduates including Alanson B. Houghton and George Santayana, and continued by Bernhard Berenson, George P. Baker, Norman Hapgood and William Vaughn Moody.

In those years the development of English composition as a major subject in the college curriculum made it easy for young men who wanted primarily to become writers to consider teaching as an economic means to that end. Herrick joined the faculty of the University of Chicago in 1893, and continued for twenty-five years to conduct classes in writing and the esthetics of literature. During this time, together with his colleague William Vaughn Moody, he benefited by the liberal policy of President Harper, who regarded creative work and scholarly research as equally worthy of encouragement. In his frequently prolonged vacations from academic duties Herrick wrote the series of novels which will probably stand as the most important and vital examples of American fiction during the first two decades of the century. Among them Mr. Newton Arvin in his "Homage to Robert Herrick," published in The New Republic, March 6, 1935, notes "The Common Lot," "Memoirs of an American Citizen" and "Together" as "three of the most impressive novels in our literature." With these may be mentioned "The Real World," which is as near as Robert Herrick ever came to revealing his own personality, with its vein of mysticism and perception of something beyond the present and tangible world, and "Clark's Field," certainly the finest of his novels in technique. Both books, in their afterglow of reminiscence, have a gracious quality unlike the hard, sometimes cruel, realism which readers came to associate with his usual work.

For Robert Herrick came to maturity in years when America was becoming acutely conscious of its shortcomings in character and achievement, its sordid and squalid lapses from civilization. It was the age of the muckrakers, and though Herrick was not of their number he frequently used special aspects of the life about him for the element of fiction which was being developed and given social significance as occupational background. Thus he held up to examination medical practice in "The Web of Life," building in "The Common Lot," big business in "Memoirs of an American Citizen," marriage in "Together." He drew his material directly from the people about him and their experience, and more than once he suffered the reproach of encroaching upon the reserves of private life. For him the question never existed. He held that the claims of his art were superior to those of personal relationships.

Herrick had the moral fervor of the puritan, turned from questions of personal to those of social salvation. He scorned the tolerance of the liberal as he scorned his individualistic creed. He attacked most fiercely the poison of selfishness in our world, "the nightmare of individualism." It is true he had no social philosophy in the exact sense which science demands. He was skeptical of programs and systems. He accepted as nonchalantly as Matthew Arnold the reproach of lacking "a philosophy with coherent, interdependent, subordinate and derivative principles." Nevertheless there is a firm intellectual fiber everywhere in his work, which leads Mr. Arvin to call his "the most humane, the most capacious and the most truly critical mind at work in American fiction since Howells and Norris." During the War he was keenly observant of American conditions, and also visited the capitals of the Allies and sections of the Allied front. From being intensely partisan he came to see the War in its true perspective, and in "Waste" he wrote one of the first American novels to deal with the epoch as reflected in an enlightened and tolerant consciousness.

In later years he traveled much in the West Indies Islands, and his appointment as Secretary to the Government of the Virgin Islands gave him an opportunity to make use of his experience and knowledge in dealing with practical conditions affecting the welfare of a people by whom he was respected and loved. He gave himself to his duties with a devotion which was the immediate cause of his death.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

Editors
BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

Assistant Editors: OTIS FERGUSON ELIZABETH HULING

Contributing Editors
H. N. BRAILSFORD HEYWOOD BROUN JOHN T. FLYNN
WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN W. P. MANGOLD
JON. MITCHELL LEWIS MUMFORD R. G. TUGWELL

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

E. G. WOOD, *Advertising Manager* BYRON DEXTER, *Circulation Manager*

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dewey: Master of the Commonplace

Second Article in the Series, "Books That Changed Our Minds"

AT THE AGE OF SEVENTY-NINE John Dewey has published a treatise on logic. This event, sufficiently remarkable in itself, is a joke of Olympian proportions on the world of 1938.

Dewey was at the apex of his reputation in the twenties. Wilsonian idealism and the War gave national scope to the leadership he had attained in education and philosophy by the publication of "Democracy and Education" and the "Essays in Experimental Logic," both in 1916. In the hush of normalcy his voice was more audible than ever. No American, not even Emerson, has ever been more widely and fully acknowledged as the intellectual leader of the nation than was Dewey at that time. When the Carus lectureship was established to be a forum for the maturest expression of our philosophic minds, it was assumed as a matter of course that Dewey should be the first Carus lecturer; and a few years later he followed Josiah Royce and William James (after an interval of more than a quarter of a century) to the Gifford lectureship at Edinburgh, historically perhaps the loftiest philosophic platform in the world. These lectures, published as "Experience and Nature" and "The Quest for Certainty," were hailed as Dewey's consummate achievement.

But that was not the end either of Dewey or the world. Much has happened in the last ten years. The loving veneration which Dewey's name aroused only a few years ago has become tinged with a faint sense of fatigue and even of impatience. I suppose this was inevitable. Veneration is a fatiguing exercise, and in the course of years Dewey's ideas have become commonplace. The younger generation was born speaking Dewey's language. To them it is their language, not his. They get no thrills from his recent books because his earlier books have become the stuff of their own thoughts, while to the older generation his latest treatise, "Logic: The Theory of Inquiry," "contains nothing new." It is a very hefty job, we all agree, "the clearest and much the most complete statement he has made of his logical position, a very creditable performance indeed and truly astonishing for a man of his age; but the point of view is substantially that of his 'Studies in Logical Theory,' contributed to the Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago in 1903."

In those "Studies" the whole force of the attack was directed against Lotze. This point is one of considerable moment. Lotze is no more than Hecuba to the present generation, but that only goes to show how different the world is now from what it was when the ideas for which Dewey stands were first enunciated. We have indeed grown up. To what extent we owe our maturity to the individual influence of John Dewey, who can say? We have no yardstick for measuring the quantity of intellectual influence. But qualities are more amenable to understanding. The character of Dewey's influence, certainly, is clear and definite. It can be adequately expressed, I think, only in terms of the commonplace and its opposite, the occult, conceived as a pervading quality not merely of the weird beliefs of remote savages but of the "common sense," as Veblen put it, of the most highly civilized communities.

Our civilization is in process of emerging from the occult on a grand scale. Some readers may be tempted to dismiss this characterization as a merely rhetorical overstatement. It is not intended as such. It is not even meant as a reproach. Our past leaves no ground for such reproaches. The truth is that even in the twentieth century we are only men and the recent descendants of savages. All that we ordinarily think of as civilization has come about within a hundred generations or so, and these hundred generations were preceded by a period at least ten times as long, perhaps a hundred times, of utter, abject, groveling obsession with the occult. That we should be haunted by such a past is inevitable under the circumstances.

Furthermore, we are not omniscient even today. Science has revealed a little something of the movements of the stars and the electrons, we know a little something about the circulation of the blood and a tiny bit about the central nervous system; but beyond this smattering on all sides lies the vasty deep of the unknown, still the natural habitat of Awful Powers. To be sure, we might argue that whenever science does penetrate the unknown the newly discovered territory always turns out to be exactly like our own backyard. But for some reason we never do. That takes genius, Dewey's kind of genius, a special affinity for the commonplace. Most people are still sure, in spite of a thousand contrary demonstrations, that Mystery lies just beyond the latest scientific fence.

For example, there is Beauty—with a capital B. People who scoff at talk of the occult are (perhaps for that reason) the very ones to insist on spelling it that way. Beauty, they insist, is Something Apart. They find it hard to say just what distinguishes the beautiful from the commonplace. Indeed they dismiss the attempt as itself commonplace: trying to apply common, vulgar word-haggling to what is Unique, Transcendent, a quality of the Spirit that only can be known intuitively and only by the finer spirits, those who are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in tune with the Infinite. Minus the sarcasm, that is how they put it. But to a vulgar reasoner what they are in tune with is capital letters; that is, with arbitrary and absolute distinctions, that is, with the occult.

The beautiful is of course a member of a celebrated triad, and as such partakes of the nature of the true and the good—or the other way around. I have led the ace of esthetics in the hope that it would take a trick. For various reasons it is easier for most people to spot hocus-pocus in High Art than in matters which are their own daily concern. But the same occultism pervades status and authority of every kind. By whatever means an oil company manages to wangle a concession, the rights they have acquired forthwith become Property with a capital P, as sacred and indissoluble as the Fundamentalist conception of the marriage tie; and any later proposal to modify, let alone dissolve, those rights will excite in the breasts of the devout the same horror with which good Catholics contemplate divorce.

There is no restricted zone to which the occult is confined. It trickles down the ages and oozes imperceptibly from one regime to its successor. For example, note the irony of John Locke's classic formulation of the theory of property. Locke denounced the humbug of the divine right of kings to which for good measure he opposed the right of property; and to make his case unbeatable he endowed property with all the sacred attributes he had just stripped from royalty, even including divine origin. Curiously enough we have done the same thing with democracy. Instead of dispensing with the idea of sovereignty we have carefully retained the ancient myth, merely transferring its prerogative from kings to the Sovereign People. Thus it comes about that even in the twentieth century many people still imagine that Democracy—with a capital D, like Property and Beauty—is a sort of sacred flame which might be instantaneously extinguished by any coup d'état and can therefore be kept alight only by the violent suppression of undemocratic enterprises.

If we are emerging from the occult, it is by a process altogether different from the substitution of one political regime for another political regime or of one set of rights for another set of rights with different beneficiaries but the same content of traditional beliefs. In this sense democracy is not the Rule of the People but the growth of enlightenment. Dewey has always identified it with education, not in the sense of government by professors but with the idea, apparently, that understanding is more important than authority. What makes the devices of suffrage and representation important, and what makes them work in so far as they do work, is general literacy, the growth of the informed interest of people generally in their general as well as individual concerns.

Obviously this educational process far transcends the schools. Modern enlightenment stems from science, from discovery and invention, from the elaboration of all the useful arts of which science is the rationale. The invention of printing has had something to do with it. So has the expansion of the material culture of the whole industrial community by virtue of which great masses of people have been lifted out of the physical and emotional importunacy of squalor and unremitting drudgery. So has the infiltration of highly technical skills. Which has been the greater educator, Henry Ford or Lee De Forest, Model T's or audion tubes?

Doubtless schools also have something to do with the educational process. Since schools must have teachers, and since teachers must have something to teach, the schools have become the chief patrons of discovery and invention, the advancement of science and the arts; and with the increasing elaboration of our scientific culture the schools have become increasingly important as the medium of diffusion of skills and of ideas. It is therefore quite appropriate that a man of Dewey's stripe should be thought of as an educator. Probably no other individual has ever exerted more influence on American education than John Dewey. Nevertheless, the force of his personal impact on education, as on modern thought, derives from the fact that it is more than personal. It is the influence not of a man but of an idea and a process, and it can be understood only by grasping that idea.

The keynote of modern education is its continuity with life. That is what Dewey has stood for always—the continuity of learning with doing and living—and not for any particular educational fad of the "child-centered" schools. Its most important result for the country as a whole has been the bursting of the narrow limitations of Culture (with a capital C) and the absorption into the schools of sciences and social studies and even common skills and minor arts, a process by virtue of which our schools have become more truly a cross section of American culture (small c) and more effectively a part of American life as a whole than schools have ever been before. And all this is a phase of the larger process of the realization of democracy and the emergence of the modern mind from immemorial tradition.

To credit such a movement to an individual would be fantastic. But even glaciers have their contours; and this process, general as it is, nevertheless turns upon an idea as specific as that of the origin of species and one quite as definitely attributable to Dewey as evolution to Charles Darwin. In a general way modern enlightenment is a function of science. But as we have already noted, even science has its boundaries, some say limitations. What lies beyond those boundaries? Shall we be scientific as far as science goes, and beyond that point reaffirm the ancient traditions of our race? Must we do so? Are we by nature dual personalities, the schizophrenic creatures of a bifurcated world? This

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is a philosophic question, and it is the answer he proposed as a philosopher that is the source of all John Dewey's influence.

As a philosopher Dewey has been concerned with the true, the good and the beautiful, that is to say with meanings and values; and the values are contingent on the meanings. "Art and Experience," the William James lectures given at Harvard University after his retirement from active service at Columbia, is the most successful attempt anyone has ever made to treat the experience of beauty as an integral and active part of our common life. "Human Nature and Conduct," in which he did the same for morals, has achieved the status of a classic by inclusion in the Modern Library. But the beautiful and the good derive from the true. If art and morality are continuous with the whole of life, the essential continuity is that of thought. That idea is the source from which all Dewey's many and various interpretations flow. Given his "Studies in Logical Theory," somebody else might have done "Art and Experience," as after a fashion several people have; but the reverse would have been impossible.

The reason is that Dewey's logic is focused on the axioms, postulates or preconceptions on which all our thinking builds. Our deepest divisions of opinion develop from our preconceptions. As Clarence Day once wrote, it makes all the difference in the world whether we are super-apes or fallen angels. This difference of assumption with which two groups of students face their facts has sometimes been referred to Darwinism and sometimes to behaviorism, and both are germane here. Why has Darwinism cut so deeply through the whole of modern thought? Why should Dewey's colleague, Veblen, have dismissed classical economic theory precisely on the ground that it is pre-Darwinian? Why should Dewey have written an essay on the influence of Darwinism on philosophy and then have thought that early essay sufficiently important to give its title to his first volume of collected papers? Not, I think, because Darwinism means change or even development. Outraged conservatives have always protested vehemently that economics dealt with change long before Darwin, and they are right. The real difference is in what is conceived to change. Darwin made the human species continuous with other species and therefore an organism, continuous with all protoplasm, and so with molecules and atoms, geologic strata and stellar galaxies. With evolution science annexed mankind. Beyond science lies the unknown, but man is no longer a part of it. To a Darwinian the idea that man can know himself only by inner contemplation is abyssal nonsense—and all that follows from it.

The issue of behaviorism runs to the same effect. This word has become intensely unpopular among psychologists because it has been claimed as the all-but-registered trademark of a narrow clique. The profession generally resents the pretensions of this clique, its claims to priority and its attempt to dictate the terms and methods by use of which alone psychology may be a science. As every student knows, behaviorism was preceded by functionalism; and as to introspection, which the behaviorist fraternity condemns so utterly, there is no valid reason why a psychologist should not use himself as a subject for experimentation any more than a physiologist, provided he is not making self-observation the pretext for assuming that one's self is a window through which to peer mysteriously inward at the Soul. And no psychologist does this any more. In America at least all modern psychology is behaviorism in the larger sense of the study of the behavior of the human (social) animal. As a science psychology has abandoned the occult much more generally than economics.

This whole movement flows directly from Dewey's instrumental logic. Perhaps we should not attach too much importance to merely personal incidents, but it is worth noting by the way that the leaders of both the behaviorist and the functionalist schools began their studies under Dewey. Certainly their conclusions flowed from his assumptions. In the preface to the 1916 edition of his "Essays in Experimental Logic," Dewey remarked that the perspicacious reader would see in them the groundwork of what had since come to be known as behaviorism; and in the 1903 edition of the earlier studies he noted that "this point of view makes it possible for logical theory to come to terms with psychology," with a cross-reference to Angell's essay on functional psychology in the same Chicago decennial series.

The point is that our conception of values—social, moral, and esthetic—turns on our notion of the mind; and our conception of mind turns on our notion of the thought process. Does the thought process itself inwardly reveal a mysterious universe of spirit that lies beyond the reach of scientific instruments? That is what savages believe, and after them theologians, and after them metaphysicians. I think; therefore my thought is pure Idea and my mind pure Spirit. It was that tradition which Dewey confronted in the contemporary of his younger days, Lotze. He confronted it with the basic scientific principle of continuity and with a philosophically calculated naïveté:

> Thinking is a kind of activity which we perform at specific need, just as at other need we engage in other sorts of activity. . . . The measure of its success, the standard of its validity, is precisely the degree in which thinking actually disposes of the difficulty and allows us to proceed with the more direct modes of experiencing, that are forthwith possessed of more assured and deepened value.

Thus he closed the abyss between thought and things on the brink of which generation after generation of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

philosophers had mulled and mumbled, by a declaration as simple and direct as that of the urchin in the presence of the naked king: that no such cleft exists or ever existed:

> This point of view knows no fixed distinction between the empirical values of unreflective life and the most abstract process of rational thought. It knows no fixed gulf between the highest flight of theory and control of the details of practical construction and behavior. It passes, according to the occasion and opportunity of the moment, from the attitude of loving and struggling and doing to that of thinking and the reverse. Its contents or material shift their values back and forth from technological or utilitarian to esthetic, ethic or affectional. . . . In all this there is no difference of kind between the methods of science and those of the plain man. . . . The fundamental assumption is *continuity* in and of experience.

In these sentences, published in 1903, I believe that future historians will find an essential clue to the turn civilization has taken in our time and to the relation of John Dewey to that movement. Consequently I regard "Studies in Logical Theory" as the more important book for the student of Dewey's mind and influence, as I think most students do. But I should not advise a student of the contemporary world to read it. For one thing, it has been out of print for years. Then too the shade of Lotze hovering in the background is distracting even to readers who do not believe in ghosts. The late reader should read the latest book. If he will raise the cover of "Logic: the Theory of Inquiry," he will find that the author begins his preface by declaring that "this book is a development" of the earlier "Studies" and "Essays," and then proceeds at once to call attention "to the principle of the continuum of inquiry, a principle whose importance, so far as I am aware, only Peirce had previously noted." The book itself is Dewey's definitive exposition of just what it means to say that human thought is a process that occurs in nature, what it means for the theory of knowledge, for the conventions of logical analysis, for science and its laws and finally for social inquiry.

It will be interesting to see what our world does with such a book. For we live in a strange world. With more knowledge, more skill, more tools at our command than men have ever had, we seem to be losing faith in knowledge, skill and tools and reverting to passion and mythology. I have ascribed the dwindling of Dewey's fame to the growing familiarity of his ideas, but obviously that is only part of the story. Mr. Earl Browder is said to have defined a liberal as one who raises doubt and indecision to the level of a principle. This is a splendid definition. It states the opposite principle of violence most clearly and succinctly. By contriving to avoid all encumbering questions as to what the violence is for, it makes that principle equally congenial to all direct-actionists, whether communist or fascist; and by making liberalism the alternative to all this it achieves a clarity which could scarcely be improved upon. Nothing defines the scientific state of mind better than doubt, and the democratic principle is precisely that of solving problems not by "decisive" authority but with understanding and the slow but eventually sure seepage of ideas through the whole community. John Dewey is a liberal in this sense; and in so far as the influence of these ideas is really waning in favor of the principle of meeting force with "decisive" force, Dewey's influence is really waning.

At the University of Chicago where Dewey's ideas were the paramount influence for about three decades, a revolt has been going on. I am told that it is leading toward a sort of "neo-Thomism." Advanced Marxians also find Dewey unsatisfactory. These are signs of the times. I have read only one review of "Logic: The Theory of Inquiry," but I note with interest that the reviewer finds "that there remain unanswered certain fundamental questions which have troubled those who find Instrumentalism . . . inconclusive." I have no reason to suppose that the reviewer is a member either of the Thomist or the Marxian communion, but his state of mind is perhaps revealed by the ensuing question: "May there not be some basic reason in the very nature of things for the fact that one idea or way of acting proves successful when put into operation, while another does not?" To the innocent reader such a question may seem innocent and even reasonable. But these Fundamental Questions about Basic Reasons for the Very Nature of Things: do they really appeal to the intelligence, or to the sense of propriety? Before the reader decides, perhaps he would do well to read "The Quest for Certainty." It is not an accident that every dogma has its hierarchy and every totalitarian regime its dogma; and it is not by omission that Dewey fails to provide us with a dogma or a dialectic. His influence flows in precisely the opposite direction. Whether the ideas he stands for will prevail—who knows? But nobody need be in any doubt as to what they are. They are the art of thinking and living in the lower case. In the bedlam of tragedy, melodrama and light opera in which we live, Dewey is still the master of the commonplace.

C. E. AYRES

Phaeton

This is the hour the youngest dread
Through the dark dared and longed-for hour
When the untried youth starts from bed
For the thronged Pleiads lower
And the bright horses display their power.

He knows what fierceness orbs the sun
Annihilating grace of fire
And dreads the god's descent upon
The uncurbed plungings of desire
The son that imitates the sire.

JOHN PEALE BISHOP

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Neutrality: Shall We Have Revision?

The President's Policy—and the People's

FORCES ARE BEING LINED UP for a terrific battle over the revision of the neutrality legislation at the coming session of Congress. It is well known that advocates of collective security, largely drawn from the old League of Nations groups, are preparing to press for changes in the law that will give the President the power to discriminate among belligerents and to use the material resources of the country to implement whatever foreign policy he may choose to adopt in that connection. This will include the authority to perform unneutral acts when war begins, that is, to enter the war on the side he favors, first by using hostile measures against the designated enemy and then, when retaliations come, by accepting the challenge of arms. To put the case in another way, it will in effect transfer the power to declare war from Congress to the President.

The real issue is therefore: Shall Congress surrender to the President its constitutional power to declare war?

Before considering this issue, it is appropriate to come into the clear in the matter of neutrality.

It is widely assumed that neutrality means that we maintain complete impartiality or equality in the treatment of belligerents, while remaining at peace and abstaining from acts of violence directed against the one or the other of the contending parties. This is an entirely false conception of neutrality as a fact. No policy of neutrality can result in an equal treatment of belligerents, for the treatment they receive under strict neutrality will depend upon the posture of their affairs and the nature of the conflict.

For example, in case of a European war, any policy of neutrality that allows any sea-borne trade to continue will favor the European powers that command the seas.

The essence of neutrality is not equal treatment of belligerents in fact. The essence of neutrality is abstention from war, abstention from hostile acts by the government and abstention from changing the policies of the government for the benefit of one belligerent or the other, *after the war has begun.*

Hence if Congress confers upon the President the power to alter commercial or other policies of the United States for the benefit of the one belligerent or the other after war begins, it will confer upon him the power to perform unneutral acts, that is, hostile acts, easily leading to war.

The latest revision of the neutrality acts already confers upon the President this power in certain respects. This revision was effected under the pressure of the collective-security advocates, with the aid of President Roosevelt and the State Department. It permits the President, after a war has begun abroad, to add articles and commodities to the primary list of contraband goods (munitions) which cannot be carried on American ships. In other words, the present law permits the President to alter the rules of the game for the benefit on the one belligerent or the other after war has started, that is, to perform unneutral acts, hostile acts.

What the advocates of collective security now demand of Congress is a more fundamental alteration. They are proposing to give the President full authority to use the economic power of the United States against any belligerent that he may designate as soon as war has started or at any time after it has started. Such a law should be called "An Act for Allowing the President of the United States to Enter Any War That Begins Abroad."

This is the issue and it should be argued on its merits as such.

Personally I am opposed to any legislation of this character.

Advocates of such legislation have called opponents bitter names. They have said that we are immoral, foolish, short-sighted and stupid. One distinguished advocate has said that we are like Cain who murders his brother and then asks whether he is his brother's keeper. I do not propose here to answer in such terms, for the matter of American foreign policy does not seem so simple to me as black and white. There are fine-spirited and honorable men and women in America who sincerely believe that the last war was really "a war for democracy" and that if the United States would join the League of Nations or underwrite Great Britain and France peace could be maintained for the United States and throughout the world.

In fact some of them put all the blame for the troubles of the world on the American people. "We fought and ran away," says Mr. George Norlin. "We left the League of Nations, the child begotten of American aspirations, a foundling upon the doorstep of Europe; we crawled into our own skins . . . and so we made the world safe, not for democracy, but for gangsterism."

In my opinion this is a simplification of the World War and world history that will not bear the test of fact and is unjust to the American people.

Many American people who were in favor of the War at the outset and applauded President Wilson's "war aims" began to have doubts about his "war for democracy" long before it ended. The Sedition Act

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of 1918 settled it for many American citizens. For others, the dream was exploded by the sight of the Versailles Treaty and the conduct of the Allied and Associated Powers after the War was over, especially the invasion of Russia. It seems to me fair to say that Great Britain and France "ran away" and left the American people in the lurch; at least, this is as fair as the charge that the American people "ran away" or betrayed their ideals.

But apart from all such recriminations, the situation is what it is now. Do the American people want to put into the hands of any President the advance power to underwrite Great Britain and France secretly and to decide what shall be done in case of another war in Europe? Public-opinion polls all indicate they do not.

Does the situation in Europe indicate that this should be done in the interest either of national security or peace?

Who actually knows what the situation in Europe really is? Reports since the Munich affair show that the plans, purposes and large designs of Great Britain and France at the time were unknown to the public or were at all events very obscure. Already we have had several "explanations" of the reasons for abandoning Czechoslovakia and surrendering the enormous military advantage of her superb defense lines.

We are told that it was all a fixed-up game, that the governments of Great Britain and France made the war scare for the purpose of justifying their coming to terms with Hitler.

We are told that Great Britain and France were not ready in a military sense to call Hitler's bluff, that Great Britain's rearmament program has been badly carried out, that British munitioneers have made millions in profit without delivering the goods.

We are told that Great Britain and France found the Little Entente unwilling or unready to fight.

We are told that the British Tories and French Tories want to work with Hitler in the business of liquidating Soviet Russia; and this is as plausible as any of the many explanations offered.

What are Great Britain and France really up to? We do not know any more about that than we did in 1914 about all the backstairs negotiations and designs which preceded the World War or in 1915 about the Secret Treaties.

Yet we are to "collect" with them now, in advance, assure them that we will underwrite them before the game of war starts, or at least will authorize the President to do it. In the light of the last three hundred years of European history, this seems to me to be no way to conduct the foreign policy of the United States.

If we are to collect with Great Britain and France, we should do it openly and on specific terms. Wilson made no advance terms in 1917 and see what we received at Versailles. To agree to coöperate on exact terms is one thing. To give to the President the power to make a secret underwriting at his pleasure is something entirely different. It is shutting our eyes and leaving our fate in the hands of the President and the State Department.

With all due respect for the President and the State Department, the American people seem to have decided that they do not want to make this surrender, and in my judgment they are absolutely right. If the surrender is made by modifications of the Neutrality Act through the use of weasel words, then the verdict of the people who will have to pay, suffer and die will be flouted by the Congress of the United States. It seems preposterous to charge the President with seeking a dictatorship because he wants a reorganization of the federal administration and then turn around and make him a real dictator in a far more important matter—the power to maneuver the country into a position from which war is the only escape.

On these grounds I hope that opponents of the collective-security group will rally in full force against its efforts to rewrite the Neutrality Act in the direction of establishing executive supremacy. I hope also that they will urge Congress to strike out of the Act the discretionary powers already conferred upon the President, namely, the power to widen the list of proscribed commodities that are not to be carried on American ships.

This does not mean that the United States will be or should be indifferent to everything that Germany, Italy and Japan do. It means no unconditional surrender to them. The United States would still be free to negotiate treaties. Congress would still be free to declare war on the three trouble makers. The President would still be free to lay his views before the country with reference to policies to be pursued.

A tighter neutrality law would merely limit the President's power to do what Woodrow Wilson did in 1914, 1915, 1916 and 1917, behind closed doors. It would force a definition of issues if there is to be a war, an open definition convincing to the country and Congress.

If the official directors of our foreign policy would quit preaching sermons to the world—sermons which they have had to eat again and again—if they would keep their powder dry, if they would turn solemn and inscrutable faces to the three world trouble makers and let them guess, then the country would be less confused and the way would be prepared for the support of necessary decisions when and if decisions become necessary. But with all the sermonizing, preaching, lecturing and sentimentalizing, with the air full of rhetorical smoke, it would be dangerous for Congress to surrender its power over war to the Executive Department, no matter who is President.

There is the issue. It is nothing less fateful than that.

CHARLES A. BEARD

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lima Addition

After much oratory and 110 resolutions and recommendations the Pan-American Conference closed its sessions. Brave words were said in defense of American democracy but the Peruvian Indians still lounge about the streets of the city of Pizarro in silent incomprehension. The Fascist director of the Italian bank is still called—if erroneously—the "viceroy of Peru," the German agents are still notifying concerns trading with Berlin that Jews must be summarily dismissed, and this little country whose white population is only 15 percent of its 6,000,000 inhabitants still has some 30,000 Japanese in its confines who remain loyal to a Mikado who gives extra-European significance to the anti-Comintern bloc.

Did the conference serve any good purpose? Has it meant anything at a moment when the whole world is preoccupied with the rise of Hitler and the new, post-Munich balance of power? Is the new world facing up to the problem of the Unholy Alliance of Germany, Italy and Japan? Or will the Fascist triumvirate threaten the independence of the Americas more seriously than the Holy Alliance, which inspired the Monroe Doctrine 115 years ago?

It is something perhaps to have placed the Americas on record against the current ideologies of Europe. Humanity and tolerance, the rule of international law, equal sovereignty of states and individual liberty without religious or racial prejudices are said to be American principles. To maintain and defend them the South American republics declare their intention to confer with each other not only against armed aggression—as they agreed two years ago at Buenos Aires—but also against "acts of any nature," by which they mean internal interference by Nazis and Fascists. If the language of this Declaration of Lima occasioned much quibbling during the conference, the final text nevertheless is both clear and unequivocal. Those who expected more binding engagements must remember that the Argentine Republic is as loath to join an American League of Nations as the United States is to enter the Geneva institution.

The conference endorsed the Hull trade principles. Reciprocal tariffs based on the most-favored-nation system are declared the fixed policy of the Western hemisphere. Barter and discrimination are condemned even by the countries that are trading with Germany at this moment. The producers of primary products can afford to neglect no trade opportunity, but they fear the implications of the German method of "barter and bayonets." President Benavides said to me: "We are trading with Germany but we have our eyes open."

His remark sums up the attitude of most of the South American countries. They agree with the United States that the aggressive, expansionist countries constitute a threat. But they do not believe for one moment that Germany, Italy or Japan, singly or in combination, are likely to attack any South American country in the immediate future. Their imminent fear is the combination of trade and propaganda with which Germany is attacking Central Europe. Five years ago Germany enjoyed roughly 20 percent of the trade of Central and Southeastern Europe. Today she has roughly 55 percent. But what can the Argentine Republic, for instance, do with beef and wheat when the North American market is closed to her? She can sell it in Europe, which is what she intends to do. When the dangers of trading with the totalitarian states are pointed out, the Argentinians suggest that Japan remains the fourth best customer of the United States.

Against conquest by propaganda Brazil offered a resolution which the conference adopted with alacrity. The Americas declare that minorities in this continent shall not enjoy special rights like those accorded European minorities with the creation of the League of Nations. The Sudeten technique is not to be applied in any American Czechoslovakia or Tunisia. Brazil fears this stratagem because her population includes about one million Germans. The Argentine Republic has an equal number of Italian residents. This resolution condones in an international instrument repressive measures already undertaken by Vargas and others who find their German and Italian colonies organized and controlled by Gestapo and Ovra agents.

The southern continent is not alarmist but it has its eyes open. While considering post-Munich Europe, the Latin Americans have also reëxamined the colossus to the north. Among the intangibles this is the most remarkable development in years. Gone—temporarily at least—are the phrases, "peligro Yanqui," or "greedy Gringo." South Americans are taking the "good-neighbor" policy on face value for the first time. This is true not only of dictators looking north again for new loans. Even Haya de la Torre, the leader of APRA, told me that he now trusted Mr. Roosevelt's sincerity.

This new spirit of trust is the result, in no small measure, of the personal prestige of Cordell Hull. As the Conference closed, Luis Moreno, the chief Argentinian delegate, said: "Mr. Hull is the glory not of the United States but of all America. He is sincere, he is intelligent and he is modest." Latin extravagance in compliment must be discounted, but I think that Luis Moreno, even after fighting Hull through most of the conference, meant every word of his tribute.

This is important at a time when the expropriation of American oil and other properties threatens quarrels which the German, Italian and Japanese agents will

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exploit. In many countries too much meaning has been read into the "glittering generalities" of Roosevelt's speeches. Mexico and Bolivia have already seized vast American interests, and with other countries watching for their own cues, Latin Americans respect strength more than generosity. Between the landing of the Marines and the lack of any effective measures to protect American interests, there is an absurd gulf. It is well that Secretary Hull has the confidence of the Latin Americans as he begins to take a firmer line.

One of the negative accomplishments of the conference was in this field. A number of delegations proposed to deny American companies in Mexico and other countries any rights as aliens, limiting them entirely to laws affecting natives. It was proposed to deny the right of diplomatic intervention entirely. Secretary Hull maintained that Americans ought not to be subjected to injustice merely because Mexicans or others find their properties confiscated without legal remedy. This proposal was spiked by the Mexican delegation!

That the American states may be able to work out amicably even so inflammable a subject as this comes as the first fruits of good will. The second fruits lie in a feeling at last that the Monroe Doctrine has multilateral value. Countries to the south are beginning to look upon the United States navy and its "flying fortresses" not simply as instruments of imperialistic policy. Those ships and planes can defend this continent. It is quite likely, therefore, that if the United States finds that it needs new Caribbean bases the South American countries will extend them. If we need a Nicaraguan canal, no Panamanian skulduggery such as Theodore Roosevelt employed against Colombia will be necessary; Nicaragua is urging its construction.

The United States navy can defend our own country and our neighbors to the south only if we keep open the Panama Canal and defend the seaways approaching it. The United States must beware losing strategical outposts, learning from the short-sightedness of the British and French who sacrificed Ethiopia at one approach and Spain at the other entrance of the Mediterranean before yielding finally on the bastion of Czechoslovakia. There are islands in both the Atlantic and Pacific that would play vital military roles. Both North and Latin America agree that if any naval power is to fortify them it must be the United States.

The atmosphere of Lima has been one of American coöperation. Can it be maintained? In the struggle for markets and political power there are many things in Central and South America which should facilitate the work of the Germans, Italians and Japanese.

In the first place, there is in Latin America very little of what we mean by democracy. The Latin speaks proudly of democracy, but he merely means independence from the motherland. But their revolutions are not comparable to the French revolution so much as to the demands of the feudal barons made on King John in Magna Carta. A handful of whites rule in most instances, and with few exceptions they are reactionary and afraid. Thus their sympathies, with certain notable exceptions, lie with General Franco.

If Franco wins, the German and Italian agents who control him will exploit a new "mystique" throughout the Spanish-speaking world. This is more vital to the policy of the United States than any other consideration at the moment. And yet we refuse to ship arms to Republican Spain while doing business with Japan.

Another consideration which works against the United States is the fact that the purchasing power of South America is woefully low. Indians can scarcely buy anything except sweated Japanese goods. Whites have serious exchange problems. They prefer American automobiles but they are tempted to buy the cheaper German or Italian product.

The next year or two will tell whether the United States is to retain that mastery of the New World which only came to us with the World War. Liquid capital is a weapon denied to the totalitarians at this moment. It should prove decisive. Two things keep me from taking Carleton Beals seriously: the gold we have buried and the laughter I heard at the cinema when Mussolini grimaced and strutted. And I think I might add a third thing—the good will which Secretary Hull is taking back with him from Lima.

Lima, Peru JOHN T. WHITAKER

Colossus in the West

THE GREATEST CONSTRUCTION VENTURE of history is half completed. In the hinterland fastnesses of the Pacific Northwest, the unfinished battlement of Grand Coulee Dam checks the swift onrush of the Columbia River. This battlement is 500 feet thick and more than four-fifths of a mile long. When built to full height, its parapet will be 550 feet above bedrock. The crest of the dam is so long that four ocean liners as large as the "Queen Mary" could be placed on it without entirely stretching from cliff to cliff. When completed, which will be about 1941, after eight years' work, Grand Coulee will be four times as big as the Great Pyramid and three and one-half times as big as Boulder Dam.

What is the purpose of this stupendous structure? It will produce the largest chunk of hydro-electric power available at any one place in the world, and it will irrigate and reclaim a huge tract of land as big as the state of Connecticut. It will open to Dust Bowl refugees from the Middle West and tenement dwellers from the East what President Roosevelt regards as a "Promised Land" on the continent's sundown rim.

These ambitious plans are costing the federal government an enormous sum. The dam and power plant will require $181,101,000. The irrigation canals will need $208,532,000. Interest charges total $15,000,000. The aggregate is $404,633,000. This is considerably

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more than the cost of the Panama Canal. The budget-balancers who shudder do not know that in 1922 the late General Goethals himself said that Grand Coulee was an undertaking of greater importance and would add far more to the national income.

The largest pumping plant in the world will force water from the Columbia River into the Grand Coulee irrigation system. One of the pumps will move more water than is used in New York City; all twelve pumps could provide water for two-thirds of the population of the United States. The water crashing over the spillway will fall twice as far as Niagara Falls. The national Capitol building could be completely buried in the face of the dam. Three of the biggest steel bridges in America have been erected for construction use; the concrete is poured from them. These bridges are more than half a mile long and 205 feet high. They are gradually embedded in the masonry, as the dam rises block on block above the Columbia River.

The hydro-electric-power potentialities of Grand Coulee are even more amazing. The late Colonel Hugh L. Cooper, who helped build the huge Dnieperstroy dam in Russia, said Grand Coulee was the greatest power site in the world. The dam will generate four times the energy produced at Niagara Falls. There will be twin powerhouses, each twenty-four stories high and covering as much ground as Radio City. So much electricity will be turned out that the plant will have to be run by remote control, so that the operators won't be electrocuted. Enough power will be generated at Grand Coulee to light two-thirds of the farmhouses of the nation. The Columbia River has more latent hydro-electricity than any other waterway ever surveyed, and already men in the wilderness are constructing the heaviest voltage transmission line in the world to connect Grand Coulee with the Bonneville Dam.

Grand Coulee is simultaneously the greatest irrigation, flood-control and power project ever planned. It will irrigate and reclaim more than 1,500,000 acres of land. This dam is one of President Roosevelt's oldest dreams. Eighteen years ago, when he made his unsuccessful campaign for Vice President, he was impressed by the untrammeled wilderness of the Columbia River region. "Look at all that water running down unchecked to the sea," he said to a friend as their train rolled along the cliffs above the great waterway. A few hours later at Spokane he told an audience that some day the hinterlands of the Columbia Basin would be developed "to contain the homes of thousands and hundreds of thousands of citizens like us." That was in 1920. Today, Grand Coulee is the fulfilment of Mr. Roosevelt's prophecy. John C. Page, the Commissioner of Reclamation, estimates that the land irrigated by the big dam will provide fertile farms for 75,000 families.

Because Grand Coulee is so magnificently conceived and because it is so personal an idea of the President's, a few of its features are all the more inexcusable. Rickety shack towns sprawl over the granite hills. They are filled with real-estate agents, taxi-drivers, prostitutes and other individuals seeking a chunk of the 7,000 pay checks earned down in the canyon. These hamlets are an unsightly mess, and there is no control of the exploitation and promotion that take place in them.

This lack of interest in supervising the shack towns has its corollary in the attitude toward labor on the dam. A number of private contracting companies are building the huge barrier under the supervision of the Bureau of Reclamation. Neither group has shown any social consciousness in keeping with the bold humanitarian purposes of the project. The CIO was virtually run out of the place. The AF of L, with a lower wage demand, was accepted only grudgingly and then not on a closed-shop basis. The Labor Board has been a party to the controversy, and an NLRB attorney told me that the engineers at Grand Coulee are as intolerant of labor organization as the most anti-New Deal lumber baron. One word from the President could correct this situation.

The irrigated and reclaimed land at Grand Coulee some day may support a million people. An irrigation district in the nearby Yakima Valley has, in the past twenty years, produced apples, peaches, wheat and other crops worth thirty-five times the cost of the irrigation system. For some time it was feared that land sharks might profitably speculate in the Coulee lands. But Congress has just enacted a law sponsored by the forward-looking Senator Schwellenbach that forbids the sending of water to any land for sale beyond a stipulated price. The water from the Columbia River will be coasted onto the soil from the Grand Coulee. This is the dry canyon through which the river flowed in the Pleistocene Age. Twenty-three miles long, more than a thousand feet deep and from one to five miles wide, it will be a reservoir of hitherto-unconceived size. Pumping the water into it involves moving the second largest river of North America from its course.

Down in the mighty canyon where the Columbia rushes to the sea, Grand Coulee's staggeringly huge battlement takes form. Not long ago a minister from the Dust Bowl looked at it. His pastorate had been burned out and he had come West with them to find a new home. I had written an article in The American Magazine about the Dust Bowl refugees and their problems, and he wrote me a letter about it. "You know," he said, "for years I have been reading about the building of the biggest battleships, the biggest bombing planes and the biggest artillery on earth. It thrilled me immeasurably to stand above that great dam and see ingenuity put to useful rather than destructive purposes. Thank God that some of the biggest things on earth are to make life better rather than to make life end!"

Spokane, Wash. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shoot the Works

With a Dash of Bitters

In Connecticut, at least, the cocktail hour used to be considered safe and sane. Nobody came much before five or remained after seven. The second-round Martinis were pretty much ice water and the conversation and the sandwiches were built around domestic caviar. In the old days no one ever said, "When you call me that smile," or invited anybody save a member of the opposite sex to step outside.

But I speak of the pre-Hitler period before fascism hovered over the shaker and your beverages were spiked with a dash of bitters. Today there is no street along the waterfront or the Bowery of New York City where it is as easy to pick a quarrel as in the leafy lanes of Old Greenwich. It was thereabouts I went the other day, having been bidden for a social afternoon. My work was done and I went without misgivings. Most members of the party were strangers to me but they seemed placid, fat and, as far as I could gather at first glance, engaged in chewing the cud of contentment.

Things began amiably enough. The large lady to my right put the ball in play by saying that she understood from our host that I was a newspaperman. When I told her that I was employed by The New York World-Telegram she merely replied in a friendly spirit that she herself always read The New York Sun.

"And, naturally," she added, "I take The Herald Tribune in the morning."

Since it was a pleasant afternoon and peace and quiet prevailed, I stifled an inclination to say somewhat uncivilly, "You would, you big truckhorse." Instead, I responded politely that in my opinion her favorite morning paper was distinguished by the excellence of its typography and its dramatic criticism. The first break in tranquillity came when the large lady put her hand to her mouth and leaned over to whisper in my ear. I remembered that in one of those "What would you do if—" books, a gentleman replied, "I would show her a photograph of my wife and children." Hastily I fumbled in my pocket for negatives. But I had the lady dead wrong. There was nothing personal in her confidential inquiry.

"Tell me," she said, "is it true The Tribune has been bought by Jews?" I replied that no such information had ever come to me and that it was my impression that the Reids were old Skull and Bones ever since New Haven. "Well, then," said the intruding matron, "it's the Communists that have gotten hold of it. It amounts to the same thing." Somewhat startled, I replied in all sincerity that to my searching eye there was no tinge of radicalism in the entire paper. "Mark Sullivan just wouldn't stand for it," I said sedately.

Lack of information seemed to irritate my fair companion. By now her voice was louder and at least an octave higher. She was pointing. Everybody else dropped whatever he or she happened to be doing in order to watch and listen. I was on the spot. With accusing forefinger, the Battleship Maine and New Hampshire bore down upon me. "How do you account for Dorothy Thompson?" she thundered. It seemed to me that I might justifiably evade a question covering such complex and wide territory. I sidestepped and answered, "Well, what's your theory?" The large lady was not without theories. She offered two in rapid succession. "The woman has gone mad," she said, "or she has been corrupted by Moscow gold."

"Once I read her every morning," the speaker of the afternoon continued. "She had the entire nation in the palm of her hand." The large lady who was fond of gestures as well as words held up a hand which would have terrified a Tunney. With all those rings it might have been as dangerous as a wallop from brass knuckles and so I cringed when she gave me a fierce glance and asked, "Do you know what I have done?"

I confessed that I had not the slightest idea, but I added hastily that I would very much like to be informed.

"I have written a letter to the editor of The Herald Tribune in which I have said 'I want to renew my subscription to your newspaper but upon the stipulation that it is sent to me only upon those days when the column of Dorothy Thompson does not appear. If you dare to send any copy containing those subversive articles I shall promptly have it burned by my gardener in the middle of the public thoroughfare.'"

"I guess that was telling them," I interrupted for purposes of conciliation.

But she was not yet mollified. "I don't know what's happened to her," she repeated. "Naturally, I never read her any more but they tell me that she's even begun to defend the Jews. What has come over her?"

"Isn't it just possible," I suggested, "that Dorothy Thompson writes as she does because she believes in what she is saying?"

That was mild enough rebuttal but I was looking for the nearest exit and the large lady was just about to blow me through it when in came Quentin Reynolds. I thought this might set up a diversion, and indeed it did save my life because the Merrimac swung around to send a shell across his bow. "They tell me you have just come back from Germany," she said to the new arrival. "What kind of time did you have?"

"I had a gloomy time."

"And why, may I ask, did you have a gloomy time? I have many friends in Germany and they're not having a gloomy time." She rose to her full height and it pleased me a little to see that even Quentin, once an iron man at Brown, quailed before the onslaught. He too sought solace in scotch and a soft reply. "It just happened that I had a gloomy time," he muttered and looked vainly for a neutral corner.

"Don't you know," thundered the grand inquisitor, "that the Jews own 90 percent of all the real estate in Berlin?"

I did my boy-scout deed for the year. "Quent," I said, "we have exactly seven minutes to catch the train." The next day I saw my host. "You should have lingered," he told me. "As you left the large lady informed us, 'Broun comes from Russia and his real name is Brounski. Reynolds is a Jew, too, although he pretends to be Irish. In Rumania he was known as Riffski and this so-called Dorothy Thompson as a child in Poland was Rebecca Thomashefski.' I guess that explains everything."

HEYWOOD BROUN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Japan Is Number One

APPARENTLY the immediate step that is supposed to follow Mr. Roosevelt's eloquent speech at the opening of Congress is an embargo on iron and steel scrap. A few days before, Senator Pittman, now the official unofficial voice of the White House on foreign affairs, in effect dared the peace groups of the country to agitate for an embargo. As far as the administration is concerned, the voters have only to ask, and they shall receive.

Mr. Roosevelt's metaphor of the hourglass in his message no doubt referred to world affairs in general. But among some of his advisers, there is a feeling that the sands are running out fastest in the Orient. Hitler may cause a crisis in the spring, but in China a crisis exists right now. This was the reason that the State Department a few days ago published its formidable note to Tokyo without waiting for Secretary Hull's ship to arrive from South America. It was the reason, too, for the Department's broad hint that no more notes would be written, and that, if further action were taken, it would be of a different character.

From the administration's point of view, an embargo on steel and iron scrap would have many advantages. Despite heavy imports in the last two years, Japan would be touched in a sensitive spot. With the world armaments race, export of scrap is already embargoed in a number of European countries. Cut off from American supplies, Japanese industry might still get scrap, but it would pay through the nose.

An embargo would also—the administration believes—be popular here. Even the dealers in scrap themselves might not complain, since with the expansion of the PWA program the domestic demand will increase. The idea of refusing to let American steel be used to murder Chinese babies—or, alternately, to kill American lads at some future date—has vast appeal among the voters. Furthermore, the experts believe Japan would be unlikely to retaliate. The Japanese military have already come close to ruining American business at Shanghai; any further repressive measures against Americans alone—in distinction to other foreigners—would be a grave provocation, responsibility for which Japan might hesitate to assume. As for Japanese industry's boycotting American cotton, she is already buying as little cotton here as possible, because of exchange difficulties.

The end of the administration's policy, of course, is to buck up Chiang Kai-shek, whose fortunes from this distance appear precarious. There is a hope that if Chiang can hang on, the nerve of the Japanese will break, as sometimes happens with surprising abruptness in the case of a proud, inhibited people. In a sense, their nerve may be said to have snapped in 1921, when they permitted the then Secretary of State Hughes to push them out of Shantung. The acerbity surrounding Baron Hiranuma's elevation to the premiership shows the present tension.

Briefly, this is the administration's story, and who knows whether it is right or wrong? In a world resembling a hospital for mental diseases, with the patients in control, nothing is necessarily right or wrong. But in the old days before Hitler, at least, the making of threats to other nations that you hadn't the means to back up was considered bad business.

At the moment, it seems likely that the chief weapon of the members of Congress who oppose a "positive" foreign policy, either in the Orient or Europe, will be the Ludlow amendment, by which the power to declare war is taken from Mr. Roosevelt and entrusted to Congress. It is a weapon of dubious morality, for, with the possible exception of Mr. Ludlow himself, it is unlikely that any Congressman thinks it would be workable or would keep us out of war. But the experience of the last two years has taught the "little Americans" in Congress three things about the Ludlow amendment. First, it has the copper-riveted support of powerful voting groups: the church people, the farmers, some of the veterans. Even more useful, it has support among people who simultaneously favor measures for collective security and, other things being equal, would be on Mr. Roosevelt's side. Second, it is an ideal hopping-off point for pacifist demagoguery: "Why is it, my friends, that our President cannot trust the war power to the representatives of the plain people?" From this, it is an easy transition to hints of dark doings on Mr. Roosevelt's part. What was it that Mr. Roosevelt told Lord Tweedsmuir in Canada last summer, the speaker can ask; what did he tell Anthony Eden at the White House a few weeks ago; what has Mr. Joe Kennedy been promising Mr. Chamberlain in London, and so on without limit. Third, it has been repeatedly proved that mention of this amendment will drive both the White House and the State Department into St. Vitus dance.

When the administration starts to push its proposal for a change in the Neutrality Act by which the President will be empowered to invoke its provisions against an aggressor nation, a greal deal will be heard of the Ludlow amendment. The "little American" group are hopeful that Mr. La Follette will take charge of it in the Senate. Its great strength, however, will be in the House. If Chairman McReynolds attempts to keep it in the Foreign Affairs Committee, enough votes can be obtained to bring it to the floor. It is believed that it would have the full Republican strength, just from deviltry, although many Republicans would virtuously oppose it if it were ever brought to a vote. Long before that, however, the "little Americans" pray that the State Department officials will break down in the screaming meemies, and agree to leave the Neutrality Act alone. One unhappy consequence of this otherwise promising program may be to prevent repeal of the embargo on the Loyalists in Spain.

The procession of White House confidants to Vice President Garner's cheery, antique sanctum in the Capitol has disconcerted administration sympathizers who for months have loyally pictured him as the center of black fascism and the instigator of the Dies committee. The fact is—as this department has vainly tried to explain—that Mr. Garner is a somewhat vain, aging gentleman, with almost no interest in the social and economic implications of New Deal measures. However, he has, or believes he has, a hound's scent for what will get votes and what won't. For weeks, roundabout word has been brought to the White House that Mr. Garner wanted to give the "chief," or "captain," the advice of an older man. Gradually the White House group saw the light, and a program of soft flattery is being carried out.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Probably it won't work, because the true administration enemies—men like Senators Smith, Bailey and George—will labor more earnestly towards the same objective. As for Mr. Dies, his relations with Mr. Garner have been difficult ever since a coolness developed betwen Mr. Dies and Majority Leader Rayburn, Mr. Garner's closest friend.

Washington T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Private v. Government Investment

ONE OF THE AUTHORS of the excellent little book, "An Economic Program for American Democracy," objects, in a letter in The New Republic of January 4, to the mildly critical comments I offered on one section of the proffered program.

I may repeat here what I have said elsewhere, that with much of that program I am in accord and that the whole essay is intelligent because it was written by men who faced frankly the one important cause of the stalling of the existing economic system—the complete failure of private investment. They faced it by insisting that, since investment is essential to the functioning of the capitalist system and since private investment has abdicated, at least for the moment, the only way to keep it moving is through government investment.

With that general proposition I have no quarrel, though I would go further and insist on certain drastic adjustments which would tend to revive private investment, at least in some areas of business. My chief point of difference with the gentlemen who offer this plan grows out of the rather loose use of the word "investment."

The authors maintain that government investment must be financed by government borrowing. And they undertake to soothe the apprehensions of those who are terrified by continuing deficits with an argument designed to prove that there is nothing to be feared in continually mounting government deficits.

I undertook in this column to point out what I believed to be the fallacy of this argument. The authors argued that the rising interest payments would not be a burden on the economic system, since the money collected in taxes to pay interest would be paid out as interest to bondholders and that with bonds held largely by the people, rather than by a few wealthy families, the whole operation of interest payments would be unimportant in its economic effects. I do not think this is true because, as the taxes to pay interest are collected from the people, they are paid, at the present time, chiefly to the commercial banks which hold most of the paper involved in the deficits created by Mr. Roosevelt. And those interest payments inure to the benefit of the bank stockholders and not to the people from whom the taxes were collected.

I have no objection to government investment. Indeed I have urged it from the beginning of this depression. Unless private investment revives there is no escape from government expenditure to provide the supplemental purchasing power needed by the economic society.

The capitalist money economy cannot function without a continuous flow of credit, originating in either private or public operations. The authors of this book correctly point out that the expansion of the economic system is always attended by a rising tide of debt. I go further. Not only is this expansion of credit (and hence debt) essential, but it is equally essential that these debts be never paid. I do not mean that the individual must not pay his debts. I mean that in order to enable one individual at some point in the system to pay a debt, at some other point in the system someone else must create at least as much new debt and in addition someone else must create an additional amount to provide the expansive energy. In the end, the only way in which the burden of debt can be kept within manageable limits, is through default liquidations.

Now, this being so, it is essential that the government shall take up the burden of investment when the private investor abdicates, as he has now. Within limits the debts created by the government through *investment* need not be unduly disturbing. But, unfortunately, the authors seem quite plainly to subscribe to a rather curious definition of the word investment. Deficits for investment are not treated as deficits by accountants in private business. But deficits for expenditure are. If the government borrows money and builds a railroad or a public utility, thus creating not only a wealth-producing but a revenue-producing instrument, that need not be treated as a deficit at all. But when the government spends more money on some current relief, recovery, social or defense activity, on an operation which, however necessary, does not produce wealth or revenue for the government, that is not an investment.

I am willing to defend WPA expenditures, minus the political skulduggery and if organized upon an intelligent basis. I might within limits, under some circumstances, support payment for this out of borrowed funds. But I would not call this an investment and I would certainly call the money so spent a deficit. And I would most certainly never approve the continuous creation of deficits for such purposes as relief, soil conservation, health and recreational and cultural objectives, though I most earnestly support the government's expansion of these activities.

There is no doubt that the flooding of borrowed funds for these or any purposes into the stream of business increases income. But the income created is transient. It promptly piles up in the savings of the higher income groups (from $5,000 up) whence it can be diverted back into the stream of spending only by private investment or public taxation. The income produced is transient, but the debt burden remains and must be increased again the next year for another shot of income. It may be all right to advocate this as an emergency plan, but not as "an economic program for democracy" on a continuing basis.

Here I insist on the distinction between borrowing to carry on government investment and borrowing to cover government expenditures. Government investment is quite another thing and public debt for that purpose has always been treated differently from debt for expenditures. But even government investment must be carefully limited. Private indebtedness can be extinguished by default liquidation. But government indebtedness cannot. And default liquidation is as essential to the capitalist system as credit itself.

JOHN T. FLYNN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Daughters and Others

Mamba's Daughters, by DuBose and Dorothy Heyward. Empire Theatre, January 3, 1939.
Vaudeville Marches On. Majestic Theatre, December 30, 1938.

SINCE IT IS DuBose and Dorothy Heyward's own adaptation of "Mamba's Daughters" which makes the play, we can assume that this is as much of the book as they thought they could get across. The life of the country and the awareness to life of Lissa, the granddaughter and precious charge, is left off-stage: the play is entirely contained in a few simple sets and groupings, a simple development in action. It makes a play of charm, difference and numerous faults; but the main thing of the evening is the success of its reality—even through melodrama it retains that mixture of earnestness, rightness and its own dignity. The main conflict is that of a protective maternal fight against circumstance and the evil of the world; the problem arising from it is the passing of one generation above the station of the other.

And that would be all, excepting some bits of comfortable wisdom from time to time, if it weren't for the music, the motion, the good ringing speech all through and the heartening sight of real people. Just being there, some of them; some of them there for the singing. The leading parts in the action were filled (sometimes to bursting) by Willie Bryant, José Ferrer, J. Rosamond Johnson, Fredi Washington. But the show focuses on Ethel Waters. Her singing voice has not that wide and leaping quality of music to be heard in so many natural voices, and in the few songs here she is even more thin and uncertain against the deep background of the choral work. But the dramatic thing it takes to put a song over (latent in her success up to now) comes into its own in this mainly acting role. She has had showmanship of course, the sense of rise and fall, phrasing, climax; but in addition there was a sincerity of both feeling and belief. As Hagar, lusty, tender, bewildered, raging, she has the chance to show how constant and intelligent that sincere quality in her is. The part makes no demands of a complex nature but it does demand something of the heroic, steadfast throughout: the patient incomprehension of the trial scene, the invective at the meeting-house, the humbleness here and there and the child's sweetness over her first "party" at the end—these require not only to be managed by themselves but to be tied together and all sustained. She still hasn't the finish of Georgette Harvey, whose old Mamba stands above all the rest like a tree, magnificent enough to have been the Ma of Bessie Smith herself. But her heart and talent are equal to the main demands, which she satisfies with her own strength.

Concern is in the air for the dear dead days of vaudeville, and—whether or not people used to take their pleasure in the old Palace or the houses of the Keith, Pantages, Poli wheels throughout the country—in the present fashion it is Ah to see the curtain raised by the Ten Tumbling Thompsons again. As a normal growth, vaudeville died years ago and there are those who hold it has been carted away. Actually its headliners passed into movies or onto the air, or they became M.C.'s or did black-outs in stage musicals or joined the increasing army of floorshow talent, or at the worst got on Major Bowes's amateur string. As for the great general body of vaudeville's performers, they were gradually lost in the shuffle partly because times changed too fast for them but to a good extent because they never had enough on the ball anyway.

Vaudeville as it was known was a valuable academy of roustabout showmanship, for the steady contact with audiences of all kinds at all times of day sharpened a kind of sixth sense of pace and timing that radio and movie work cannot give. And to this school we are indebted for many of our most honored troupers. But there is no getting away from the fact that taken as a whole vaudeville was pretty lousy. The majority of its acts were dull, stereotyped and crude; its bookers lacked imagination; it employed the minds of the worst writers in this country and I dare say any other. It wouldn't change and so the country, educated to something a little better, changed instead. Spare a tear if you wish; I say the hell with it.

Recently we have had that round-up of acts and horseplay called "Hellzapoppin," and that is supposed to be something: it gets you in the aisle and then steps on you. Actually I recall about three first-rate ideas or turns in more than a full vaudeville bill of vague and vulgar nonsense—taking vulgarity to mean the quality of being loud, tasteless and above everything dull. And if that is theatre then Abe Lyman was putting on higher art last year at the Casa Mañana with the sole aid of a cigar and some pick-up and rather cross Sunday-night guest stars.

The Federal Theatre people have been rounding up the neediest cases from the old vaudeville time, with the idea of reviving some of its glories (someone from Mr. Dies's committee must have spied that the word vaudeville wasn't American but probably a Red code, because his bloodhounds are out). And now Kurt Robitschek opens up at the Majestic with some better material and the idea that "Vaudeville Marches On"—two hours of fairly unrelated turns three times a day with a dollar top and a fortnightly change of program. The first show seemed to have some good stuff among its tumblers, muscle acts and comedy singles (where was the seal? I didn't see any seal). Both Eddie Garr and Al Trahan managed to tear the house down; and the other two headliners were Fats Waller and Molly Picon, who was simply awful. The show in general rather resembles the new-type vaudeville of the more elaborate casinos, with three mistresses of ceremonies and a general air of hard driving, intimacy with the audience, topical gags and take-offs. But I should like to signalize a trio of imported goofs billed as the Wiere Brothers, who do some of that rare fooling which is comic in the freshest sense, inimitable, simple, gay and mad. Technically they are comedy dancers, and as such their precision is uncanny; and they do a little balancing, which is likewise; but they are more than that, they are everything out of nothing at all, like "Alice in Wonderland," Clayton, Jackson and Durante, Rags Raglan; and absolutely new. They keep a heavy vaudeville audience steadily in stitches and actually have to beg off the stage—yet they still seem not of this world, as though they came to us from the Little People. OTIS FERGUSON

While Stark Young is out of New York on a leave of absence, Otis Ferguson will review the theatre in addition to motion pictures. —THE EDITORS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Bandwagon

According to one well informed source, Schacht warned British treasury officials that unless Germany could obtain a loan of $2,500,000,000 "extremists would obtain the upper hand in Germany." – *News item in The New York World-Telegram.*

He did everything expected socially of an honest and prosperous man. He attended town meetings, established a heart clinic in Bridgeport . . . and contributed generously to the Republican Party. – *F. Donald Coster (Musica) as described in The New York Herald Tribune.*

Due to many requests from our patrons and in view of our family trade and the youngsters who attend our theatre we have canceled our horror show. In its place we will show "I Am a Criminal" and "Scandal Sheet." – *Sign on a motion-picture theatre in Baltimore.*

Yes and No, But Don't Quote Me

I think it may be all right, then again, maybe it isn't.– *Harry F. Sinclair, millionaire oil man, asked his views on the national situation. Quoted in The Los Angeles Herald and Express.*

Many Happy Returns

The bride walked to the altar on the arm of Alfred Gwynne Vanderbilt, her half-brother. She wore a white satin dirndl and a veil of old lace that her mother wore at the first of her four marriages. – *News item from The St. Louis Post-Dispatch.*

Getting Rid of the Unemployed?

In Peekskill where the PWA has made a grant . . . the abatement of population is to be facilitated by the construction of an incinerator. – *News item in The New York Times.*

One Big Union for Two

The maternity wards of Vienna are full, the Berlin Zwölf Uhr Blatt said today, indicative of a joyful holiday period "that was predicted in the happy time of Anschluss" last March. – *Associated Press dispatch from Berlin published in The New York World-Telegram.*

All's-Well-That-Ends-Well Department

It is a measure of the progress expressed in these instruments of appeasement [Munich accord, Anglo-German and Franco-German declarations] with their mutual undertakings and obligations that in the growing antagonisms and declining confidence of a year ago, nobody would have dared prophesy that within twelve months the four great European nations would have advanced so far along the road to conciliation. – *Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain's New Year message to a Conservative Party magazine, quoted in The New York Times.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column and $1 will be paid for each item used. Address The Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – THE EDITORS

Correspondence

The Carnegie Endowment—for Peace?

SIR: As a faithful reader and contributor to The New Republic I trust that I may be permitted a few words of comment and criticism regarding Horace Coon's article published a few weeks ago—"An Endowment for War." Mr. Coon alleges that the work of the Division of Intercourse and Education of the Carnegie Endowment is "futile," "ineffective" and "innocuous"; that it is a "sounding board" for propaganda by Nicholas Murray Butler and "an aggressive agent for the promotion of war"; and that the trustees of the Endowment are capitalistic war-mongers, anxious to "whip it up for war" as in 1917.

I respectfully submit that the attempted indictment is at several points at variance with the facts and that the total impression which it conveys bears no resemblance to reality. I have long been a faculty adviser of college and university International Relations Clubs which receive books and pamphlets from the Endowment. These publications are selected with one purpose only in view—that of distributing honest and accurate studies of international problems for the enlightenment of youth. A list of titles distributed during the past ten years will reveal no propaganda purpose of any kind, save a preference for democracy as against despotism and for peace as against war. It will further reveal an appreciable emphasis upon the economic problems which Mr. Coon declares that the Endowment has ignored. . . . If this activity is "futile," then all education is futile and there is no validity in the basic presupposition of the democratic processes. . . .

Mr. Coon's quarrel with the Endowment resolves itself into a difference of opinion between himself and some of the trustees as to whether peace can best be served by isolationism to escape war or by international coöperation to prevent and suppress war. Mr. Coon is assuredly entitled to his opinion, but it is scarcely honest of him to give a list of eleven trustees and to treat the other seventeen as non-existent. . . . While the Carnegie Endowment is not committed to any specific program of action, its purpose is *international* peace and its motto is "Pro Patria Per Orbis Concordiam." It may legitimately be accused of "internationalism." But Mr. Coon does ill to impute dishonest motives to this preference. . . .

Williamstown, Mass. FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN

SIR: For overwhelming proof that the Endowment is futile, ineffective and innocuous, I can only refer Professor Schuman, or anyone else interested, to the Yearbooks. Dr. Butler's reports in these, his numerous speeches under Endowment auspices or as the Endowment's president. . . .

Concerning International Relations Clubs, Dr. Butler reports, page 61, 1937 Yearbook: "In a definite attempt to find some substitute for ruthless, stupid and ineffectual arbitrament of war, the members do not confine themselves only to discussion. A better understanding of the problems confronting the world

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enables Club members to become, in turn, instructors of public opinion. There is a steadily increasing number of students ready to give lectures and conduct discussions among the townspeople of their respective communities, in local clubs, churches and associations." How these things contribute to the "substitution of judicial processes for appeal to armed force" only idealists like Professor Schuman can understand. A few individuals may be encouraged to stand out against war when it comes, but can the Endowment be trusted to back them up? Not on its record.

I admit that such books as "The Adventures of Tom Sawyer" contain no insidious propaganda; as for the other titles sent out by the Endowment, that is a matter of opinion.

In one paragraph I listed eleven trustees out of the twenty-five and I mentioned three others: Drs. Butler, Scott and Shotwell, in the article. The other *eleven* (according to the 1937 Yearbook) are: Daniel K. Catlin, Norman H. Davis, Francis Pendleton Gaines, Charles Hamlin, Frank O. Lowden, Peter Molyneaux, Roland S. Morris, Henry S. Pritchett, James R. Sheffield, Maurice S. Sherman and Silas H. Strawn. Their connections with big business may be seen in "Who's Who."

. . . But I cannot fly into that atmosphere of idealism Dr. Schuman inhabits or share his naïve faith in treaties against all the evidence of history. As for the future, it seems to me that historians should be more cautious in their predictions.

New York City HORACE COON

The Teachers' Union

SIR: The hullabaloo in the press about the resignation from the American Federation of Teachers of Professor John L. Childs one year ago, and of Dr. Louis Hacker recently, raises an important question for trade unionists. Assume for the sake of argument that the alleged reason for the withdrawals is true—that the union is dominated by Stalinists. It is also true that the union has a record of positive achievement of which it can be proud. Limitation of space permits mention of only two items:

1. The formulation of a program of democracy and the initiation of efforts which resulted in the adoption by the Board of Higher Education of by-laws on democracy more progressive perhaps than those of any college or university in the country.

2. The organization of close to 1,000 college teachers, the largest group of this kind in the world.

It is also true that much still remains to be done. On the Columbia campus the union is faced with the problem of securing tenure, regular increments, clearly defined standards for promotion, democracy in administration, etc. What, then, is the job of the trade unionist? To withdraw from the union as Childs and Hacker have done? Is that a solution for the problems ahead? Childs has again and again asserted his belief in united effort; Hacker is an expert on the power of organized trade-union groups. Are we to conclude from their recent statements that they now believe that more can be achieved through individualistic action than through collective bargaining?

New College, New York City LEO HUBERMAN

More Light on the British Empire

SIR: So sorry, but I'm afraid Dr. Lovett was just as much in a hurry to damn Dr. Briffault's latest book (*vide* review, New Republic, December 28) as the latter was in a hurry to doom the British Empire which is its subject. Dr. Lovett says the author is in error when he speaks of the Liberals deporting seven laborers for the crime of "combining" in 1834, and that this despotic act was perpetrated by the Tories in 1825. But actually such deportations occurred in 1834 as well as in 1825. The condemnation of the "Dorchester Laborers" (six of them, not seven) in 1834 was the knock-out blow for Robert Owen's Grand National Consolidated Trades Union.

Santa Monica, Calif. LEWIS BROWNE

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Mary N. Winslow of the National Women's Trade Union League of America, Washington, D. C., sends us the texts of the Lima Declaration of Women's Rights and the Resolution on the Inter-American Commission of Women. They resolved "that women have the right to political treatment on the basis of equality with men; to the enjoyment of equality as to civil status; to full protection in and opportunities for work; and to the most ample protection as mothers." A commission was established to advise future conferences so they may promote improvement in the status of women. Miss Winslow reports that the passage of these resolutions was very largely the work of the NWTULA.

Mary Winsor, on the other hand, writes from Lima on the same subject but with an entirely different point of view. She assigns the achievements of the Inter-American Commission of Women at the Lima Conference to the "masterly leadership of its chairman and founder, Doris Stevens." Miss Winsor traces the history of the work of the National Women's Party at Havana, Montevideo and in Washington between 1928 and 1933, but, she asserts, the Lima Conference has changed the status of the Inter-American Commission of Women for the worse. It has been placed under the supervision of the Governing Board of the Pan-American Union and discriminatory clauses relating to the labor of women have been added to the Declaration of Women's Rights. Miss Winsor regards the Declaration as "an attack on women's equality . . . putting the status of the Commission back to where it was ten years ago."

Julietta Kahn of The Menorah Journal, 63 Fifth Avenue, New York City, announces a Twenty-fifth Anniversary Dinner of that publication on January 19, at the Hotel Astor, in celebration of its distinguished career in the field of Jewish life and letters. . . . Frances Barnes of the American Labor Party, 151 West Fortieth Street, New York City, announces a luncheon which the Women's Division of the ALP is giving in honor of the Right Honorable Margaret Bondfield, former Minister of Labor of Great Britain. It will be held at the Roger Smith Hotel, 40 East Forty-first Street, Saturday, January 14, and the subscription is 85 cents.

What's on the Air?

Education for Recreation," a symposium by professors from New York University, Teachers' College and Columbia University, Saturday, January 14, 12 noon, NBC-Blue Network.

Jan Masaryk, former Czecho-Slovakian Ambassador to London, speaks on "Democracy and the Minorities," Saturday, January 14, 6:15 P.M., CBS.

"Americans All—Immigrants All," the story of German immigration to the United States, Sunday, January 15, 2 P.M., CBS.

The American School of the Air relates the story of the fight for free education, Monday, January 16, 2:30 P.M., CBS.

Colonel Louis Johnson, Assistant Secretary of War, talks on "American Wings," Tuesday, January 17, 10:45 P.M., CBS.

Musical and dramatic programs of the week include a dramatization of the life of Minot, the Harvard Medical School professor who discovered a cure for pernicious anemia, Saturday, January 14, 2:30 P.M., CBS; Arturo Toscanini, Saturday, January 14, 10 P.M., NBC-Blue Network; Sheridan's "School for Scandal," Sunday, January 15, 1 P.M., NBC-Blue Network; the New York Philharmonic (300th broadcast), Sunday, January 15, 3 P.M., CBS; "Mr. Whipple Is Worried," Monday, January 16, 10 P.M., CBS; Rochester Philharmonic, Wednesday, January 18, 8:30 P. M., NBC-Blue Network; and Alfred Wallenstein's "Sinfonietta," Thursday, January 18, 8:30 P.M., Mutual.

All times given are Eastern Standard Time.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Transatlantic View

THE WINTER ISSUE of Scrutiny, an English quarterly review published at Cambridge by a group of the younger instructors, carries a leading article on "The New Republic and the Ideal Weekly." The article was written by H. A. Mason, but there are grounds for believing that it also represents the opinion of his colleagues, including the redoubtable Mr. Leavis. Although flattering on the whole —much too flattering, I think—it shows a real insight into our problems and contains some pretty sharp criticisms. I should like to summarize it at length before making a few comments of my own.

Mr. Mason's purpose is "to suggest an approach toward the formulation of a standard for a weekly journal of opinion." The approach he suggests is to examine the files of The New Republic for one complete year. He has chosen 1931 "as being sufficiently recent and at the same time far enough removed to insure a proper critical balance"; but his judgments are checked and verified by reference to more recent years. "I propose," he says, "to review the contents of the copies I have selected . . . and in suggesting where The New Republic attains or falls short of its standard, to come near to an ideal that . . . will serve as a criterion by which our English weeklies can be measured."

He believes that the signed articles in The New Republic, by way of contrast with the English periodicals, are its most praiseworthy feature. He divides them into five general categories. First come those dealing with "matters which are engaging or should engage the immediate attention of the government. As far as I can judge they are extremely competent and present a wealth of technical detail and such acquaintance with the problems of government as comes rightly from experts who expect to be read by an intelligent public and by fellow experts. . . . I risk the observation that they are more impressive on questions of internal administration than on long-term policy. The occasional supplements that I remember struck me as models."

The second category consists of articles on general economic questions. These, Mr. Mason says, "maintain an equally high standard. When descending to the details of business, The New Republic shows a particularity that I suppose our libel laws would prevent." He supposes rightly. An English editor told me that to print a page like John T. Flynn's in his own paper would cost a minimum of twenty thousand pounds a year in libel suits, the truth being no defense in England. The third category consists of articles on general social questions. "The selected year is rich in examples. . . . In this field The New Republic appears more lively than any English journal and manages to throw light on so many aspects of American life which do not come up for comment in England." On the other hand, Mr. Mason believes that the articles on foreign politics "are often more naïve and presuppose a public less well informed than ours." The fifth and last category consists of articles on the sciences, arts and philosophy, which "do not call for separate consideration under this head. They are in fact merely an opportunity to treat at greater length topics which arise from the general reviewing."

This leads Mr. Mason to the section of the paper that most closely concerns me. "In many respects," he says, "though with reservations, as will appear, the reviewing pages are a model of what weekly criticism should be. At any rate a strict comparison of a review of the same book from The New Republic and The New Statesman provides an exercise in comparative criticism which supplies its own comment. Quite an anthology of opinions that would hold today could be taken from this one year. . . . The New Republic reviewers are not handicapped by the belief general in England that no useful service can be served by trying to assess the importance of contemporary literary figures. They are constantly engaged in sorting out of their recent history those writers who have something important to say."

Mr. Mason concludes his preliminary investigation by saying: "A reader who is chiefly interested in the criticism of American writers is presented over a period of years with a gradual crystallization of opinion about the important contemporary writers. . . . The New Republic enables its readers to participate in the best opinion of the day and not to be twenty or fifty years behind the times as in England."

In the second part of his article, where he tries to assess the general virtues and failings of this magazine, Mr. Mason is less definite and harder to summarize. Perhaps the picture of the ideal weekly is still too vague in his mind to serve as a standard for judging the imperfect weeklies that exist. In any case, he knows what he likes and doesn't like. He quotes with admiration the editorial note that preceded a series of articles: "They are the outcome of conversations among the editors of The New Republic that have been occurring for several months and the gist of which may be of interest to our readers as raw material for thought and discussion." The note reminds him once more "that there is a continuous interchange of criticism among those responsible for The New Republic. . . . Such criticism, apart from its value in securing unity, has the equally useful result of clarifying differences. A sickly feature of English periodicals—the overindulgent treatment by fellow reviewers of any book written by the fraternity—is almost wholly absent." He likes our "healthy bias towards referring all questions to present needs," an attitude that he contrasts with the "quaint and delicate dilettante antiquarianism" of many English reviewers. He also likes what he calls "the Middletown approach to society," which enables the New Republicans, so he says, "to blend skillfully the economic, social and cultural in their presentation of America." This approach, "with all its limitations, makes possible a kind of synthesis mutually illuminating and transforming all its elements." He compares it with the divided purpose of the English weeklies, where the editorials seem to be marching firmly in one direction and the book reviews in another.

But this is precisely the point at which his criticisms begin. The New Republic synthesis is not the one that he would adopt for his ideal weekly. He thinks that political opinions —and especially Marxist opinions—play too great a part in it. He would prefer a unity based on values derived from literature instead of politics, and one, I gather, in which the politics was much more conservative than our own. He thinks that our literary criticism is terribly uneven. "Poetry in particular comes in for the most uncertain treatment. . . . A New Republic reviewer is capable of swerving from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

good sense to elementary fallacy in the course of a single article. One may of course retort that good criticism of poetry is rare enough anywhere. Yet it remains true that the central theme which should give sharpness and delicacy to the whole body of criticism functions fitfully and as it were coarsely." A graver charge, however, is that some of us are getting tired. "A review must finally be judged by the quality of its chief writers. Often they are too few and (as happened with that excellent organ The New Frontier) they write themselves out." The New Republic has escaped this fate, but some of its best contributors are now writing beneath the level of their best work. "One may tentatively suggest (with a due and sufficiently grim awareness of the situation in England) as a possible reason for this decline the poverty of the critical milieu. No weekly journalist can hope to produce good work regularly without the support of more leisured writers."

Mr. Mason's final judgment should be quoted at length:

> The New Republic with all its faults does at least succeed in providing a certain standard firmly enough maintained for deviations from it to be easily detected. Moreover it does supply with all its deficiencies the essential material for the irrigation of public opinion. The best available thought is sooner or later reflected in its pages. And—a note which has not been sufficiently heard in this survey—it presents its material in a lively, flexible way. It has carried on for twenty-four years in an environment bleaker than ours, with a circulation smaller in proportion to the size of the reading public than that, say, of The Spectator. And it has carried on with such relative success in spite of having at times to do the work of a quarterly as well as that of a weekly. . . . The existence of The New Republic is a standing challenge to the intelligent public of this country. Why have we no such paper here?

I suspect that this judgment is somewhat affected by the pathos of distance. Our achievements loom up to Mr. Mason like clouds on the western horizon; our faults are partly veiled in the sea mist. Seen from this side of the water, The New Statesman and Nation, which is closest to us of our English contemporaries, is also an approach to the ideal weekly. The difference between us is not primarily the work of the editors, English or American (although no survey of this paper would be complete unless it mentioned the lasting influence of Herbert Croly). It is not the result of a model displayed before us, like an ideal bag of oats. Chiefly it depends on the different publics for which the two weeklies are written.

The public of The New Statesman seems to me amazingly definite and homogeneous. I picture it as composed of teachers, civil servants, journalists and perhaps lawyers spending their days in London and their evenings in a Sussex cottage where they smoke well seasoned briars and potter about in the potting shed. They are not a numerous class—the circulation of The New Statesman is the same as ours or a shade smaller—but England is a smaller country and they play a fairly important role. Advertisers recognize their need not only for books but for stout walking shoes, safe investments, small cars, progressive schools and Virginia cigarettes. Their intellectual center is Bloomsbury, and I have heard it said in England that The New Statesman reflects the tone and opinions of a good Bloomsbury dinner. The remark was offered a little condescendingly, but it made me feel envious rather than superior. A good English weekly is a hydrometer that records a whole stream-flow of opinion. An editorial paragraph in The New Statesman may summarize an evening of argument, with half a dozen people contributing to the final judgment. And that judgment gains in persuasiveness expressed in the tone of good conversation.

The level of literary competence—I did not say of literary talent—is higher in England. The average page of The New Statesman is written with more ease, with shorter words and looser sentences, than the average page of The New Republic. The task of assigning a book for review is easier for the English editor, since any one of a hundred writers might pass a sound judgment on it, in a printable style, whereas the American editor must choose from no more than a dozen. On the other hand, too many of the English critics write in a tone of supercilious indifference, as if they were afraid to speak out on any subject that matters. Perhaps that fear is not unconnected with the general fear of change and the future that is spreading through English society. And always there is the English law of libel, as omnipresent and conducive to timidity as the Tsar's official censorship.

In this country the chief difficulty for a weekly journal of opinion is the lack of a unified audience. Our readers are scattered over the country from Maine to the Mexican border, with more of them in New York than in any other city, but not more proportionally to the population than in Los Angeles or Washington. They are of different groups and professions, young and old, rich and poor, to judge from their letters, but most of them belong to the intelligent left wing of the middle class. The trouble is that the members of this intelligent left wing do not form a class by themselves, to be identified and numbered. The qualities that distinguish them are real but difficult to measure. Many of them live in comparative isolation, and there is no one locality where their opinions are orthodox, as those of The New Statesman are in Bloomsbury.

It would be impossible for The New Republic to reflect the tone of their dinner-table conversation. There are few dinners here, in the English sense, and there is comparatively little intelligent conversation. Americans talk to exchange information, but seldom to amuse themselves: instead they drink or play games. Anyone here who writes about ideas tends to write like a prophet in the wilderness. And he also tends to write badly, in the sense that the language he uses is not that of his everyday speech; the words he uses come out of books and go back into books, like documents returned to a filing cabinet. Perhaps this situation also explains Mr. Mason's remark that "a New Republic reviewer is capable of swerving from good sense to elemental fallacy in the course of a single article." Some of the fallacies are simply points where we disagree with Mr. Mason. The others might have been recognized in advance if the reviewer had been able to test his opinions conversationally.

I don't want to paint too bleak a picture. The American audience, as contrasted with the English, is serious, patient, full of curiosity. It listens to shop talk, which in England is bad form, and it even listens to economists and philosophers. The American writer is not afraid to get mad or enthusiastic, or to risk his reputation for his opinions. There is no skeleton in his closet—nothing, I mean, to compare with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the English feeling that their society mustn't be handled too roughly for fear of its falling apart. The American hasn't lost his eagerness to experiment or his sense of working toward ends that can be reached in the future.

Indeed, most of the virtues that Mr. Mason ascribes to The New Republic are those of its writers and readers. The other virtues are partly caused by the shortcomings of our audience—in the sense that we are trying to compensate for its geographical dispersion and its difficulties of communication. We hope that our readers will never agree with one another, will never be intellectually *gleichgeschaltet.* But it is one of our ambitions to maintain among them a general level of taste and information, a *consensus* to which a magazine can fruitfully appeal. We feel that such a consensus is necessary not only in the arts but also in politics and economics. And this aim of ours, much more than "the Middletown approach," explains the unified impression that Mr. Mason admires.

Of course there can be no "ideal weekly," any more than there can be an ideal house. The weekly exists in relation to its public, just as the house exists in relation to its site and its tenants. When Mr. Mason gives praise to The New Republic, together with some blame, we deduct only our proper share of both, our commission as agents. The rest we pass on to our contributors and our sometimes overburdened readers.

MALCOLM COWLEY

Books in Review

Brokers of Ideas

The American Politician, edited by J. T. Salter. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 428 pages. $3.50.

PROFESSOR SALTER has collected in this volume nineteen portraits of men who play a part in American political life. They range from nationally known figures like Senators Norris and Vandenberg to local names like Mr. Sickler of Salem County, Pennsylvania, and Representative Anna Brancato of the same state. Few of them are without some real illumination; though there is a tendency in all of them to maintain something of the log-cabin tradition which makes success in itself a test of significance. They are, too, mostly essays in kindness. Few readers of these pages would gather how little aware Senator Vandenberg really is of the forces that move the modern world, or how completely he is the predestined victim of his own flowery rhetoric. The "Happy" Chandler of this book would not, I think, satisfy a serious student of Kentucky politics; he would seek in vain for that cheapness and bombast which make the ex-Governor so able in concealment of the deeper issues of American life. On Mayor LaGuardia, Senators Norris and La Follette, on ex-Congressman Maverick and "Honest Tom McIntyre" (a pseudonym), there is much of real value. We learn how they work. We see their habits of mind, the things they really care about, the patience with which they move toward their end. Professor Salter's portrait of Sol Levitan of Wisconsin is sheer delight; a unique figure is painted in the round. But Miss Reinhold's account of Representative Brancato has really no place in a book intended for the serious student. It belongs, in style and content, to the Horatio Alger epoch. I do not understand its inclusion except upon the basis that the editor suddenly remembered that he had nothing about a woman in his collection.

The range of types covered is so large that it is not easy to find a common denominator. Senators Norris and La-Follette alone have any real program about the world in which they live; clearly enough, Mayor LaGuardia is built of the stuff out of which the big man is made. Most of the rest are either the normal products of the machine, like Senator Tydings and Miss Brancato, or inspired preachers like Mr. Thomas. There are two exceptions. Mr. Hoan and Mr. Henck stand for that ideal of efficient administration as such for which the American citizen yearns at intervals; but they operate in a theatre too small to have any national significance. The "mystery man" of the book is Mayor Wilson of Philadelphia. After reading the essay on him twice, I do not understand either the motif of his career or the reason why he attained the position he did.

A politician, in general, is a kind of broker of ideas; from the confused welter of ideas clamoring for recognition, he offers for sale those he thinks most likely to bring him success. He must have the yearning for power, something of the actor's love of an audience, the capacity to create an immediately recognizable personality, infinite patience, the ability to be ahead of other men, yet never so far ahead that they cannot recognize where he is going without undue discomfort. Almost all the figures in this book seem to possess these qualities. When they do not conform to the type, like Senator Norris or Mr. Norman Thomas, they either make their impact by a supreme integrity (Senator Norris seems to me the noblest figure in American political life) or, because, as with Mr. Thomas, the idealist strain in American politics responds with respect to the technique of the ineffectual angel whose angelic qualities are beyond dispute.

The politician is a necessary animal in a political democracy; the complexity of its processes has got far beyond anything the amateur can hope either to understand or to dominate. One studies his operations with fear as well as with hope. Senator Vandenberg or ex-Governor Chandler might easily, on the material here presented, be a significant figure in an American fascist movement; the one because he has no realization of the relation between means and ends in a changing world, the other because he has really no ultimate programmatic ambition except a theatre in which to perform. It is, I think, significant, too, that, in any conscious way, there are not more than half a dozen of Mr. Salter's collection who either know through systematic understanding where they are going or why it is desirable to go there. Only three or four of them, at most,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are leaders in the same sense that President Roosevelt is a leader; they lack, that is, the power to educate the voters to great ends which they maintain as constants in all the changing fortunes to which they are exposed. For the rest, office is the great end itself; and the quality of a candidate is a function of his availability for office. I wish, in this connection, Mr. Salter had given us one man who, like Senator Hastings, is the instrument of the bigger purposes which define the contours of the party struggle. The absence of the type vowed to the service of American business enterprise is a defect in a book of very considerable interest.

HAROLD J. LASKI

A Heavy Review of Light Verse

The Oxford Book of Light Verse, chosen by W. H. Auden. New York: The Oxford University Press. 553 pages. $3.

AUDEN'S PREFACE to this book is quite interesting. He discusses the effect on poetry of the poet's relation to his audience. In a homogeneous society, he says, this relation is close, as in England up to the time of the Elizabethans, and it is easy for the poet to communicate what he perceives but hard for him to "see honestly and truthfully, unbiased by the conventional responses of his time." In a society like that of the nineteenth century, in which the poet finds himself isolated, it is easier for him to see and criticize, but harder for him to communicate with people. "Light verse," according to Auden, is not merely *vers de société*, but all such verse as has been composed to be sung or spoken in the first of the above situations and all verse written in other kinds of periods which has "for its subject matter the everyday social life of its period or the experiences of the poet as an ordinary human being."

Auden has tried to get out of this theory a principle of selection for an anthology; but it has not worked out very well. "Light verse," as he defines it, includes the tragic as well as the comic. But "light verse" in the ordinary sense must always suggest humorous verse: and in the actual selection of his pieces, he has been consistent with neither definition. What he has included *is* mostly more or less humorous. He neglects the old somber ballads; and if he includes modern ballads on tragic themes, they are usually pieces like "Casey Jones," which have been turned into comic songs, or pieces like "Frankie and Johnny," which always seem more or less funny. (He has put together the best version of "Frankie and Johnny" which I have yet seen in print.) On the other hand, he has included several specimens of such consummately studied writing as that of A. E. Housman and Pope, which has little in common with colloquial speech and which can hardly be said to have for its subject matter either the everyday life of the period or the experiences of the poet as an ordinary human being.

So that, no matter how we adjust our point of view, we soon find ourselves thrown out of focus; and the whole book is rather disappointing. There are things in it that are charming and amusing; but there is somehow not enough of anything. What the Oxford Press probably ought to have done was to have gotten Auden to edit an anthology of folk poetry, which he would have been admirably qualified to do, and somebody else to edit an anthology of humorous verse. As it is, the only sense the book makes is in illustrating Auden's own tastes and throwing light on what he is trying to do himself; and this would be far from clear to a reader who had never read any of Auden's verse, as there are unfortunately no specimens of it included. "Virtues which were once nursed unconsciously," he says in his introduction, "by the forces of nature must now be recovered and fostered by a deliberate effort of the will and the intelligence." Certainly Auden has been successful in doing something of this kind himself—in his socially conscious imitations of popular songs and his conversationally running satire. But I don't know that it is really possible—though it is often nowadays attempted—to produce satisfactory anthologies by picking among the work of the past from the point of view of something new which has just appeared in the present.

EDMUND WILSON

On What Foundations?

Money to Burn, by Horace Coon. New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 360 pages. $3.
Philanthropic Foundations and Higher Education, by Ernest Victor Hollis. New York: The Columbia University Press. 377 pages. $3.50.

BOTH THESE BOOKS, "Money to Burn," by Horace Coon, and "Philanthropic Foundations and Higher Education," by Ernest V. Hollis, lend themselves to easy classification. They deal with the same subject, namely the ends for which financial foundations appropriate their funds. The first is general, comprehensive and popular. The second is specific, limited and academic. If style of presentation is to be considered as the guide to consumer-readers, it appears that the first volume should be read only by those who have a cursory interest in the question of surplus wealth and its public use, whereas the second should be read only by those who care about the influence which surplus wealth exerts upon higher education. In reality, the formula should be reversed in order to allow the narrow educationist to see his situation in its larger setting and to give the casual reader an opportunity to see the problem in the light of specific consequences.

These two studies are complementary; their basic facts are derived largely from the same sources. Both authors are aware of the fact that the foundations exercise an influence upon American culture which far exceeds the quantitative total of their gifts. Both feel that there is something incongruous in the relationship between these reservoirs of wealth and the democratic society in which they function. Mr. Coon is more positive than Mr. Hollis in asking for a greater public share in foundation policy-making. Both admit that the foundations have exerted an influence upon American life that is mostly good and partly bad. Neither author suggests a plan for bringing the foundations and their policies into alignment with the more progressive and more technical conceptions of current and future needs.

The structure of "Money to Burn" carries the reader forward in logical sequence from historical background, through developments of interest, to foundation investments, and finally to administrative personnel and future

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prospects. Says Mr. Coon in regard to this last subject:

> Foundations have weathered the depression with their capital funds intact. With these they can continue their researches, the importance of which cannot be overestimated. Because of their dependence upon the profitable operation of the economic system of which they are a part, their activities must necessarily be restricted. . . . If millionaires use the foundation idea as a means of their own protection, to conserve their fortunes into perpetuity, to maintain through trustees who are relatives or business associates a financial or industrial oligarchy, to glorify their names while avoiding taxes, to guard their group interests by influencing education and public opinion, they may set in motion forces which will eventually take over for the government the foundations themselves.

Although Mr. Coon does not say so explicitly, he seems to believe that the research which is done through foundation grants must be necessarily weighted on the side of the status quo and vested interests. It is difficult to see how this could be otherwise, in spite of some notable exceptions, as for example some of the industrial studies conducted under the auspices of the Russell Sage Foundation. It is precisely at this point, I believe, that the foundations will soon be obliged to make concessions to the public interest. A democratic society cannot survive unless the people have ready access to relevant facts. The present corps of foundation trustees is not capable of deciding on the question of relevancy. They are not, for the most part, liberal in disposition nor are they trained in the methods of science. In research it is even more important to know that the problem selected is pertinent than to know whether or not the final statistical results are trustworthy.

The purpose of Mr. Coon's inquiry now converges with that of Mr. Hollis. The question which the latter asks is specific and clear: "To what extent and in what direction has higher education in the United States been influenced by the philosphy, the administration, the activities, and the money of philanthropic foundations?" According to his analysis, the foundations have helped to define the American college and its role, they have disseminated useful information regarding higher education through the instrumentality of numerous surveys and studies, they have contributed to student-aid through scholarships and fellowships, they have promoted faculty welfare and stability, they have expanded and improved professional training, and they have advanced the various sciences and humanities. In the twentieth century alone they have contributed $220,000,000 to the endowments of three hundred colleges and universities, a sum which represents one-third of the total endowments. When viewed as a whole it is obvious that the foundations have made an impact upon higher education which is greater than that emanating from any other single source. In what direction has this impact been?

Mr. Hollis' answer to that question is twofold. He believes that the influence of the foundations upon higher education has been salutary, and that the foundations have been invariably more advanced and more progressive in their educational conceptions than the leaders of colleges and universities themselves. He does not think that foundations have been equally progressive in other fields; and one is led to conclude that his method of comparison with respect to the lagging practices of colleges and universities provides him with an escape that is a bit too simple. The basic question is not whether the foundation administrators have been more progressive than the college officials, but whether the foundations have aided the more progressive colleges and the more progressive elements in colleges.

These two serious and competently written volumes must be considered as an integral part of a growing critical literature concerned with the proper function of vast accumulations of wealth in a democracy. These two authors have moved the more comprehensive project at least one step forward.

EDUARD C. LINDEMAN

Goya Lives On

Goya: A Biography, by Charles Poore. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 303 pages. $3.50.

IT IS NO BELITTLING of Mr. Poore's thoughtful and conscientious study of Goya's life and works to say that his book is most interesting when it is invoking all the dramatic parallels that exist between the Spain of its hero and the Spain of the international Fascist invasion. Mr. Poore does not insist on any of these parallels. In fact, he keeps them carefully and unobtrusively in the background at all times. Of necessity, though, they do intrude upon the reader, until "The Disasters of War" becomes an additional propagandist assault upon the Fascist forces, the struggle of the peasantry against Napoleon merges with the struggle of the popular forces against Franco, and the Spain of Ferdinand VII and the Spain of the Falangistas seem comparable lands of the Dark Ages.

Although the comparison with the present that any biography of Goya must call up is not the responsibility of Mr. Poore, his book both gains and suffers by it. The gain comes from an increased dramatic effectiveness and an air of timeliness that do not impair the work's value as a study of its hero. Unquestionably, though, "Goya" does suffer from the fact that the sections of the book which do not invoke passions of present-day Spain seem by contrast to be cold and undramatic. For, in truth, Mr. Poore makes little attempt to be colorful, picturesque or dramatic in his writing. His account of the great man's history and his record of his works are presented with clarity, intelligence and insight, but "Goya" is not without its stodgy moments. A slight objection might be raised, also, against the somewhat too limited picture of the man that the book offers.

Mr. Poore does not attempt to deny the gusto and raciness of Goya's character, but he considers some of the most popular legends of his hero's prowess and he is inclined to disbelieve them. Speaking of the "Maja Naked" and the "Maja Dressed," he says, rather regretfully: "It will always be as futile to try to dispel the belief that they represent the Duchess of Alba as it will be to dispel the flagrant rumors of Goya's adventures in Rome, the tales of a guitar-and-dagger-haunted young manhood, or the story that he once took a fowling piece to the Duke of Wellington." No doubt he is correct in refusing to have anything to do with such legends, but in keeping with this attitude of objection to romantic nonsense Mr. Poore tends to make Goya an unnecessarily moderate fellow. Certainly, though, he does not underrate him as an artist, placing him, with considerable justice, above El Greco and, sensibly enough, Velasquez.

RICHARD WATTS JR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labor History

American Labor, by Herbert Harris. New Haven: Yale University Press. 459 pages. $3.75.

CONSIDERING the opportunities for melodramatic incident, vivid characterization and the exciting sweep of ideas, it is strange that so few writers have been attracted to the history of American labor. Much of the spadework has already been done, principally by the John R. Commons group at Wisconsin. But what has been needed is the work of analysis and synthesis, of simplification and popularization. Of course, many histories of labor have been published; but most of them are colorless and dull, loaded down with footnotes, figures and other scholarly baggage, and moving along in a prose style that has all the bounce of an annual statement of ownership or a legal contract.

By far the most satisfactory general history to date is the handsomely printed "American Labor," by Herbert Harris, who has been reporting labor affairs for the past ten years and has in this way accumulated a store of first-hand knowledge. It is a keen book, written with verve and drive. In fact, it comes close to meeting the requirements of that long needed history of American labor.

The main fault of this history is to be found, I think, in its structure. The opening two chapters furnish an excellent, though breathless, review of the American labor movement from its beginning until the formation of the American Federation of Labor in 1886. At that point the book branches off in several directions like the arms of a candelabrum. Confronted with the perplexing tangle of materials of the past fifty years, Mr. Harris selects certain sample threads to unravel separately. He surveys seven typical unions: the United Mine Workers, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, the American Newspaper Guild, the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, the railroad unions, the United Automobile Workers and the textile workers' union. In these unions are reflected the varied tendencies of American labor, from cynical racketeering and graft to idealism and devotion to a cause; and in them can be laid bare the most urgent problems that face the labor movement. A long concluding chapter tries to weave these threads together into a single fabric.

Mr. Harris' method results in many disturbing gaps. Such highly important groups as the steel and agricultural workers, for example, are hardly mentioned; while many of labor's most dramatic strikes—like the Seattle general strike of 1919 and the San Francisco general strike of 1934—are completely omitted. Even more serious than the gaps is the lack of unity and continuity. Instead of sailing down a single river from source to mouth, the reader travels back and forth so often over parallel streams that what he sees is out of perspective. Moreover, to his bewilderment, he finds himself stopped occasionally in midstream and turned back to trace the source of some subsidiary current, as in the discussion of the IWW during the chapter on the textile unions, or in that of Marxism during the concluding chapter. And yet the book is so much better than anything else in the field, and so humane and sympathetic in its treatment, that I feel guilty in pointing out its faults. It is merely, I suppose, that so fine a job leads one to imagine what might have been.

SAMUEL YELLEN

MODERN AGE

OFFERS THE BOOKS OF THE DAY AT A PRICE YOU CAN PAY

50¢ EACH

1. HOPE IN AMERICA
by John Strachey. They wouldn't let him talk, but you can still *read* his study of the struggle for power in the U. S. "Thousands of people will want to read it."—*N. Y. Times.* 50¢

2. SCHOOL FOR BARBARIANS
by Erika Mann. Thomas Mann's daughter tells the frightful facts about education under the Nazis and what it is doing to Germany's children. "Sensational but documented."—*Time.* Introduction by *Thomas Mann.* 50¢

3. I LIKE AMERICA
by Granville Hicks. A native sees the country he loves as it is, and as it might be. A moving and thoughtful book. "Should be read by student, politician and housewife—regardless of political creed."—*St. Louis Post-Dispatch.* 50¢

4. ONE-FIFTH OF MANKIND
by Anna Louise Strong. The story of China's heroic struggle for freedom. "The best short account of the war in China to date."—*Book-of-the-Month Club News.* 50¢

75¢ EACH

5. LIFE INSURANCE: Investing in Disaster
by Mort and E. A. Gilbert. It tells what's wrong with the insurance racket and what you can do about it. Introduction by *Arthur Kallet.* 75¢

6. JAPANESE TERROR IN CHINA
by H. J. Timperley. Not an atrocity tale but the authentic documented accounts of neutral eyewitnesses who reveal in the day by day accounts of rape, robbery, murder, the meaning of modern war. 75¢

7. SPECIAL 95¢

For the use of medical and allied professions only

PRACTICAL BIRTH-CONTROL METHODS
by Norman E. Himes, Ph.D. A practical manual prepared with the medical collaboration of *Dr. Abraham Stone.* Introduction by *R. L. Dickinson.* Foreword by *Havelock Ellis.* 95¢

FREE EXAMINATION: If you aren't delighted with these books you can return them within 5 days for a full refund.

MODERN AGE, 432 Fourth Ave., N. Y.
Please send me the books encircled below:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Name .....
Address .....
☐ I enclose.....(10¢ extra per book for shipping.)
☐ Send me a complete list of books. R 2

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Books: A Reader's List

BACKGROUND TO MODERN SCIENCE, edited by Joseph Needham and Walter Pagel (Macmillan, $2). An authoritative and useful work that consists of lectures given by ten of the leading British scientists, including the late Lord Rutherford, W. L. Bragg, Sir Arthur Eddington and J. B. S. Haldane. They review the achievements of the past forty years in their respective fields, the emphasis being primarily on technical advances. Later volumes in the same series will deal more comprehensively with the development of science and its influence on industry and social needs.

ALMANAC FOR NEW YORKERS, 1939, compiled by the Federal Writers' Project (Modern Age, 50 cents). "Weather, Day by Day Events, Slayings, Amazing Prophecies, History, Fiendish New York Happenings, Maps, Quips" (for the most part rather weak), "Seasons . . . AND more than 1066 Helpful Hints for the Metropolitan Gentleman and for his Lady. With an Urbane Commentary on The World's Fair." F.P.A. likes it.

AMERICAN CASTE AND THE NEGRO COLLEGE, by Buell G. Gallagher (Columbia, $2.50). Thoroughgoing, scholarly and realistic. All the multifarious radii of discrimination are followed, one by one, from the campus on out, so that the book becomes a full statement of the American Negro's problems, academic only in its objectivity. The soundest work in this field to date.

DEFENSE OF ART, by Christine Herter (Norton, $2). A short survey of contemporary writing on art, with some good, hard words for the mystical and pedantic theorists.

THE ART OF ENJOYING ART, by A. Philip McMahon (Whittlesey House, $3). A kind of primer for the earnest student. "Clear and practical directions"; numerous illustrations.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF MEDIEVAL ENGLAND, by J. E. A. Jolliffe (Van Nostrand, $5). Not for light reading: an authoritative study of English constitutional changes from the English Settlement to 1485.

THE LAND IS LARGE, by Emerson Waldman (Farrar and Rinehart, $2.50). A Jewish family flees from the degradations of Tsarist Russia, but finds that life in America offers fresh variations of cruelty and racial oppression. A timely story, told with an understanding that often fails to offset the effects of stilted and generally feeble writing.

KINGS AND THE MOON, by James Stephens (Macmillan, $1.60). Poems. Thee and thou and 'tis no more. But the title gives fair warning of the occasional studied quaintness of subject and mannerism, and if you don't mind them too much, go to. The blurb got it right: "remarkable depth and simplicity," qualities rarely found in today's verse.

Contributors

C. E. AYRES is professor of Economics at the University of Texas. He is the author of several books, including a biography, "Huxley," published by W. W. Norton.

JOHN PEALE BISHOP is the author of two books of verse, "Minute Particulars" and "Now with His Love," and a novel, "Act of Darkness."

CHARLES A. BEARD has written numerous books and articles on history, economics and politics. Macmillan will publish in March his latest manuscript, written in collaboration with his wife, Mary Beard. It is called "America in Midpassage."

J. T. WHITAKER reported the Pan-American Conference at Lima for his paper, The Chicago Daily News.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, formerly Northwestern correspondent for The New York Times, is the author of "An Army of the Aged" and the co-author, with Stephen B. Kahn, of "Integrity: The Life of George W. Norris." His most recent book, "Our Promised Land," was published by Macmillan.

HAROLD J. LASKI, the distinguished British political scientist, is in the United States at present, giving a series of lectures at Columbia University and Radcliffe College. His "Parliamentary Government in England" was published in the fall by Viking.

EDMUND WILSON's most recent book, "The Triple Thinkers," was published last spring by Harcourt, Brace. He is at work on a study of Socialist theory and practice called "To the Finland Station," sections of which have been printed in The New Republic.

EDUARD C. LINDEMAN, one of The New Republic's contributing editors, is a widely known writer and lecturer and a member of the faculty of the New York School of Social Work.

RICHARD WATTS JR. is the dramatic critic of The New York Herald Tribune.

SAMUEL YELLEN, a member of the English faculty at Indiana University, is the author of "American Labor Struggles" and a contributor to The Nation and Science and Society.

At World Famous
WINTER GARDEN
B'way & 50th St.
Evgs. (8:30) $1.10 to $3.30, except Saturdays. Holiday evenings and Holidays.

"Season's Unchallenged Smash Hit."—V. Y. Times
HELLZAPOPPIN
Cast of 100—50 Lovely Girls
"OLSEN & JOHNSON'S Uproarious Musical virtually rolls 'em in the aisles. The bigger they are the harder they laugh." NEWS.
3 Matinees Weekly: Wed., Thurs. & Sat. $1.10, $2.20.

The classified rate of The New Republic is $4 an inch for one insertion, $3.50 an inch for three insertions, $3.00 an inch for six insertions, Advertising Department, 40 East 4th St., N. Y. C.

TRAINING FOR SOCIAL ACTION. Practical full-time training in publicity, campaigning, administration, organizing for persons contemplating service, paid or volunteer, in social action movements as distinguished from social work. Under direction of Roger N. Baldwin. Limited to ten students; February to June.
Apply to New School for Social Research, 66 West 12th Street, New York City.

LITERARY HELP

THESIS WORK, RESEARCH PAPERS. Special Articles, Addresses, promptly prepared to requirements of busy professionals. Our extensive experience available at moderate rates, with assurance of scholarly, serviceable results. Over twenty years consistent service to patrons. AUTHORS RESEARCH BUREAU, 516 Fifth Avenue, New York.

FOR RENT

UNUSUAL APARTMENT connected with progressive adult education center; 6 rooms and bath, large fenced-in garden. Branch public library in building. Ideal for cultured family with children. Meals available if desired. Phone Kingsbridge 6-4182.

FRENCH • SPANISH • GERMAN • ITALIN
The Effortless Way

Master any of 23 Foreign Languages and English with Phonograph Record Courses. Bargains in Linguaphone, Cortina and every other make—20 different sets in French alone. Up to 45% off list price. Rentals as low as $1.25 a month. A saving proposition for teachers, students, children, clergy, doctors, travelers.
Mail Orders Everywhere
The Economical Way
Send for New Booklet R
LANGUAGE SERVICE 507 FIFTH AVE. at 42nd St., N. Y. C.
Sets Rented—Sold—Exchanged—and Purchased

TEACHER, 39, driving to Mexico early in February on Sabbatical is desirous of contacting another, to share expenses. S. Koral, Brooklyn Technical High School. Address: Box 117, New Republic.

CORRESPONDENCE CLUB

HAPPINESS CIRCLE, the best anodyne for the lack of camaraderie. Enclose stamped envelope for details. Dept. W, Box 107, Grand Central Annex, New York

The ownership of books engenders a deep personal satisfaction. It is the true mark of a person of culture.

Books are an investment that pays lasting dividends in contentment, entertainment and advancement.

AMERICAN BOOKSELLERS ASS'N.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED